arXiv:math/0312230v2 [math.DG] 1 Mar 2004

Asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundles and an application to pure twistor D-modules

Takuro Mochizuki

Abstract

We study the asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundles. First of all, we prove a local freeness of the prolongation by an increasing order. Then we obtain the polarized mixed twistor structure. As one of the applications, we obtain the norm estimate of holomorphic or flat sections by weight filtrations of the monodromies.

As other application, we establish the correspondence of semisimple regular holonomic D-modules and polarizable pure imaginary pure twistor D-modules through a tame pure imaginary harmonic bundles, which is a conjecture of Sabbah. Then the regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture follows from the results of Sabbah and us.

Keywords: Higgs fields, harmonic bundle, variation of Hodge structure, mixed twistor structure, D-module.
MSC: 14C30, 53C43, 32S40.

1 Introduction

1.1 Simpson's Meta-Theorem

The guiding principle of our study is the following, which we call Simpson's Meta-Theorem:

Principle 1.1 *The theory of Hodge structure should be generalized to the theory of twistor structures.* ▮

In [52], Simpson stated the above principle as follows:

> **Meta-Theorem** *If the words "mixed Hodge structure" (resp. "variation of mixed Hodge structure") are replaced by the words "mixed twistor structure" (resp. "variation of mixed twistor structure") in the hypotheses and conclusions of any theorem in Hodge theory, then one obtains a true statement. The proof of the new statement will be analogous to the proof of the old statement.*

We regard it as a kind of principle. As for the study of variation of pure twistor structures (harmonic bundle), it may occur that the proof of new statement is not analogous to the proof of the old statement, in our current understanding.

1.2 The purposes in this paper

We have two main purposes in this paper.

1. In the previous paper [38], we discussed the behaviour of tame harmonic bundle imposed the nilpotentness and the trivial parabolic structure conditions. We would like to remove the assumption. We also improve the argument. In particular, we use the reduction to Hodge theory more efficiently.
2. We would like to apply the study on the behaviour of tame harmonic bundle to the theory of pure twistor D-module, introduced by Sabbah.

1.3 On the purpose 1

Our principle in the study of tame harmonic bundle is as follows, which is a 'corollary' of Simpson's Meta-Theorem:

Principle 1.2 *The asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundle should be similar to the asymptotic behaviour of variation of polarized Hodge structures.* ▮

Although our goal is to show the theorems known for complex variation of polarized Hodge structures, we do not follow closely [47], [8] and [25]. Instead we follow the more differential geometric method pioneered by Simpson. We refer the following two difficulty to apply the classical method in the Hodge theory directly.

(a) The nilpotent orbit theorem for harmonic bundle is not known.

(b) In the case of harmonic bundles, we have non-trivial eigenvalues of the residues and non-trivial parabolic structures.

1.3.1 The difficulty (a)

In the study of complex variation of polarized Hodge structures, which will be abbreviated as CVHS in the following for simplicity, the nilpotent orbit theorem due to Schmid is quite important, and it is a starting point of the later studies of Cattani, Kaplan, Kashiwara, Kawai and Schmid. However, we do not know even the formulation of nilpotent orbit theorem for harmonic bundles. Since the harmonic bundle can be regarded as a pluri-harmonic map from a complex manifold to a symmetric space, it would be possible that we would obtain a generalization of the nilpotent orbit theorem for harmonic bundle, after the study would be made progressed. (See Remark 12.4, for example.) But anyway we do not have the nilpotent orbit theorem at the moment, and thus we will find another starting point.

Remark 1.1 *Now we have understood the asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundle pretty well, and hence the author does not think that a generalization of nilpotent orbit theorem is necessary as a starting point, although it would be interesting.* ▮

1.3.2 The difficulty (b)

We have the non-trivial eigenvalues of the residue of the Higgs field, and non-trivial parabolic structures. As an example, we have the following simple example. Let Δ^* denote the punctured disc $\big\{z \in \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, 0 < |z| < 1\big\}$.

Example Let us consider the holomorphic bundle $E := \mathcal{O}_{\Delta^*} \cdot e$ of rank 1 over Δ^*. We have the Higgs field $\theta := \alpha \cdot dz/z$ ($\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C}$) and the metric h determined by $h(e,e) := |z|^{-2a}$ ($a \in \boldsymbol{R}$). Then it is easy to check that the tuple (E, θ, h) is a harmonic bundle.

In the case of variation of Hodge, the corresponding Higgs field is always nilpotent. Hence if $\alpha \neq 0$, the example cannot be the variation of Hodge structures. In the case $\alpha = 0$, the example is Hodge. However if a is not rational, then the monodromy of the corresponding local system is not quasi unipotent. Recall that it is often assumed that the local monodromy is quasi unipotent in the study of variation of Hodge structures. In this sense, the example is far from (usual) Hodge in the case $(a, \alpha) \notin \boldsymbol{Q} \times \{0\}$.

1.3.3 A starting point in the paper [38]

In our paper [38], we discussed the problem under the assumption that the difficulty (b) does not occur, namely, the assumption of the nilpotentness and the trivial parabolic structure. We recall what was our starting point in [38], instead of the nilpotent orbit theorem.

We put $X := \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$, $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. We put $\mathcal{X} := X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{D} := D \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame nilpotent harmonic bundle with trivial parabolic structure. We have the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}$ and the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}$ on $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$. We prolong the sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$ to the sheaf ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}$ by imposing the condition on increasing order. (See the subsection 2.2 for ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ and ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$.) Then we proved the following.

Proposition 1.1 (Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.9 in [38]) *Under the assumption of the nilpotentness and the trivial parabolic structures, the* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$*-module* $^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ *is locally free, and* $\mathbb{D}$ *is a regular* λ*-connection, in the sense* $\mathbb{D}f \in {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E} \otimes \Omega_X(\log D)$ *for any section* $f \in {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$*.* ▮

Then we obtain the holomorphic vector bundle $V_0 := {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\{O\}\times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ on the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. The residues $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ induce the nilpotent endomorphism $\mathcal{N}_i$.

On the other hand, we have the harmonic bundle $(E, \partial_E, \theta^\dagger, h)$ on the conjugate complex manifold $X^\dagger - D^\dagger$. We put $\mathcal{X}^\dagger := X^\dagger \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ and $\mathcal{D}^\dagger := D^\dagger \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$. We obtain the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^\dagger$ and the μ-connection $\mathbb{D}$, and then the prolongment ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^\dagger$. Thus we obtain the holomorphic bundle $V_\infty := {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^\dagger{}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}$ and the nilpotent endomorphism $\mathcal{N}_i^\dagger$ on the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$.

We glue $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ by the relation $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$, and thus we obtain $\mathbb{P}^1$. By taking a point $P \in X - D$, we obtain the gluing of $(V_0, \mathcal{N}_i)$ and $(V_\infty, -\mathcal{N}_i^\dagger)$. Thus we obtain the holomorphic vector bundle $S(E,P)$ and the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i^\triangle : S(E,P) \longrightarrow S(E,P) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}^\triangle(\underline{n}) = \sum \mathcal{N}_i^\triangle$ induces the weight filtration W on $S(E,P)$.

Proposition 1.2 (Theorem 7.2 [38]) *The filtered vector bundle* $(S(E,P), W)$ *is a mixed twistor structure.* ▮

Propositions 1.1 and 1.2 are the starting points of our study in the paper [38]. Then we obtain the constantness of the filtrations, the compatibility of the nilpotent maps, the norm estimate, the limiting CVHS and the purity theorem by using some geometric argument.

1.3.4 When the difficulty (b) occurs

When the difficulty (b) occurs, we cannot use the argument in [38] straitforwardly. Let us see what happens in the example in the subsubsection 1.3.2.

In the example, ∂_E and $\theta^\dagger$ are as follows:

$$\partial_E e = e \cdot (-a)\frac{dz}{z}, \quad \theta^\dagger = \overline{\alpha} \cdot \frac{d\overline{z}}{\overline{z}}.$$

Then we have the frame f of $\mathcal{E}$ given as follows:

$$f := \exp\bigl(-\overline{\alpha} \cdot \lambda \cdot \log |z|^2\bigr) \cdot e.$$

The λ-connection is as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}f = f \cdot \bigl(\alpha - a \cdot \lambda - \overline{\alpha} \cdot \lambda^2\bigr) \cdot \frac{dz}{z}.$$

In particular, $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}) = \alpha - a \cdot \lambda - \overline{\alpha} \cdot \lambda^2$. The norm of u with respect to h is as follows:

$$|f|_h = |z|^{-a - 2\,\mathrm{Re}(\overline{\alpha} \cdot \lambda)}.$$

Then we obtain $-\mathrm{ord}(|f_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}|_h) = a + 2\,\mathrm{Re}(\overline{\alpha} \cdot \lambda)$, which depends on λ, in the case $\alpha \neq 0$. It means that the sheaves ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ or ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ for any $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n$ are not locally free. Namely Proposition 1.1 does not hold in general. (See Remark 8.1 on the explanation from the view point of the curvature.)

1.3.5 How we can modify?

First we discuss the prolongment for fixed λ, namely we consider the prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ to the sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ on $\mathcal{X}^\lambda$. In this case, we can show the local freeness by the essentially same argument as the proof of Proposition 1.2.

Proposition 1.3 ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ *is locally free.* ▮

Then we have following two structures of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^\lambda}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$.

- The parabolic filtration ${}^iF$, which is a filtration of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^\lambda}$ in the category of vector bundles.

- The generalized eigen decomposition ${}^i\mathbb{E}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}$ with respect to the action of the residue $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$.

They are called the KMS-structure (Kashiwara-Malgrange-Sabbah-Simpson).

The parabolic structure F is determined by the increasing order, namely it is given as follows:

$${}^iF_c\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}\big) := \mathrm{Im}\Big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+(c-b_i)\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \longrightarrow {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\Big).$$

The filtration ${}^iF$ and the decomposition ${}^i\mathbb{E}$ are compatible, in the sense ${}^iF_a = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\boldsymbol{C}} {}^i\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} \cap {}^iF_a$. Then we obtain the following data:

$$\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i) := \big\{(a,\alpha)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, {}^i\mathrm{Gr}^F_a\, {}^i\mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|D_i},\alpha)\neq 0\big\} \subset \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}.$$

We put $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i) = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{b}} \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i) \subset \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. The elements of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ is called the KMS-spectrum at λ. The number $\dim {}^i\mathrm{Gr}^F_a\, {}^i\mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|D_i},\alpha)$ is called the multiplicity of $(a,\alpha)\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}},i)$.

We have the $\mathbb{Z}$-action on $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ as follows:

Lemma 1.1 *Let (a,α) be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. Then $(a,\alpha)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ if and only if $(a+1,\alpha-\lambda)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$. The multiplicities of (a,α) and $(a+1,\alpha-\lambda)$ are same.* ▮

We have the bijection $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. For $u=(a,\alpha)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$, we put as follows:

$$\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u) := \big(\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u),\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big), \qquad \begin{cases} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u) := a + 2\,\mathrm{Re}\big(\lambda\cdot\overline{\alpha}\big), \\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u) := \alpha - a\cdot\lambda - \overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda^2. \end{cases}$$

We note that $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ is the eigenvalue of the residue $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D})$ in the example. We also note that $-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)$ is the increasing order of f in the example (the subsubsections 1.3.2 and 1.3.4).

The following proposition is essentially due to Simpson.

Proposition 1.4 *The map $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u)$ induces the bijection $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$. The multiplicities are preserved.* ▮

Note that the map preserves the $\mathbb{Z}$-action.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}=\{1,\ldots,n\}$. Then we have the filtrations ${}^iF$ $(i\in I)$ and the decompositions ${}^i\mathbb{E}$ $(i\in I)$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_I^{\lambda}}$: It can be shown that they are compatible. Then we obtain the following subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^I\times\boldsymbol{C}^I=(\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C})^I$:

$$\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I) := \big\{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha})\in\boldsymbol{R}^I\times\boldsymbol{C}^I \,\big|\, {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\, {}^I\mathbb{E}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\mathcal{D}_I^{\lambda}},\boldsymbol{\alpha}\big)\neq 0\big\}.$$

We put $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I) := \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{b}} \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I)$. The element $\boldsymbol{u}=(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha})\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I)$ is called *KMS*-spectrum, and the number $\dim {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\, {}^I\mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\mathcal{D}_I^{\lambda}},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is called the multiplicity of $\boldsymbol{u}$.

Similarly to the case of $I=\{i\}$, we have the $\mathbb{Z}^I$-action on $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I)$, preserving the multiplicities.

Proposition 1.5 *We have the bijection $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, I) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, I)$, preserving the $\mathbb{Z}$-action and the multiplicities.* ▮

Then we put as follows, for any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}} := {}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}\, {}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E},\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})).$$

The residue $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ induces the endomorphism of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. The unique eigenvalue of the endomorphism is $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$ by our construction. The nilpotent part is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_i^{\lambda}$.

Remark 1.2 *The tame harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ is nilpotent and with the trivial parabolic structure, if and only if the set $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$ is same as $\mathbb{Z}^n\times\{0\}$. Due to the $\mathbb{Z}$-action, we have only to consider the spectrum $0\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\underline{n})$, and we have ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_0 = {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|(O,\lambda)}$.* ▮

Then we obtain the family $\bigl\{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigm|\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}\bigr\}$ of vector spaces. We would like to give the structure of a holomorphic vector bundle over the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. In the case where $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ is nilpotent and with trivial parabolic structure, we have the holomorphic bundle ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}$, and thus we obtain the holomorphic bundle ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}}$, which gives the structure of the holomorphic vector bundle of the family $\bigl\{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{0}\bigm|\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}\bigr\}$. As we have already said, the sheaves ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ or ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ are not locally free in general, we cannot apply the method directly.

Let us pick any point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. Let us pick an element $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $b_i\not\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$ for $i\in\underline{n}$. Let us take a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0. We put $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0):=\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times X$ and $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}:=\{\lambda\}\times X$.

Proposition 1.6

- *Then ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free sheaf on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.*
- *For any point $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we have the canonical isomorphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}\simeq{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.* ∎

Let $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ denote $D_i\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, and $\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}$ denote $D_i\times\{\lambda\}$. We have the filtration ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}$ of the vector bundle ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$:

- The restriction of ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ to $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}$ is same as the parabolic filtration ${}^{i}F$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda_0}}$.
- The restriction ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ to $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}$ is same as the generalized eigen decomposition ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda_0}}$.
- ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ are compatible.

Let us explain the restriction of $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ to $\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}$ for a point λ near λ_0. The relation of the filtration $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the parabolic filtration F on ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}$ is as follows:

$$ {}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}={}^{i}F_{b+\epsilon}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}\bigr). $$

Here ϵ denotes a small number depending on b and λ. We also have the following:

$$ {}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\alpha\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}=\bigoplus_{|\beta-\alpha|<\eta}{}^{i}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}},\beta\bigr). $$

For any subset $I\subset\underline{n}$, we obtain the filtrations ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i\in I)$ and ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i\in I)$ of the vector bundle ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, and they satisfies the relations as above.

Then we put as follows, for any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$:

$$ {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}={}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\,{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{n}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\bigr). $$

Then we have ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\lambda}={}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ for any point $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. When the intersection $S:=\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\cap\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)$ is not empty, we have the canonical isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,S}\simeq{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_1)}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,S}$. Thus we obtain the global vector bundle ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\simeq{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\lambda}\simeq{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. We also have the nilpotent endomorphism $\mathcal{N}_i$ $(i\in\underline{n})$.

By the same construction for the tame harmonic bundle $(E,\partial_E,\theta^{\dagger},h)$ on $X^{\dagger}-D^{\dagger}$, we obtain the holomorphic bundle ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ for any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,0},\underline{n})$, with the nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}_i^{\dagger}$.

We have the morphism $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ given by $(a,\alpha)\longmapsto(-a,\overline{\alpha})$. It induces the bijection $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})\longrightarrow\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,0},\underline{n})$. We denote the correspondence by $\boldsymbol{u}\longmapsto\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}$. Then we have the gluing of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, and thus we obtain the vector bundle $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$. We also obtain the nilpotent morphism $\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}:S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)\longrightarrow S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)\otimes\mathcal{O}(2)$. As in the previous paper, we put $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}(\underline{n})=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}$, which induce the weight filtration W on $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$. Then it can be shown that $(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P),W)$ is a mixed twistor structure, which is called the limiting mixed twistor structure.

Remark 1.3 *We have another gluing, and the resulted vector bundle is denoted by $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$. In fact, it is more close to the traditional construction of the limiting mixed Hodge than $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$.* ∎

1.3.6 Polarization of the limiting mixed twistor structures

We discuss the naturally induced polarization S on the limiting mixed twistor structure, following Sabbah [42], who considered the polarized limiting mixed twistor structures for tame harmonic bundle on a quasi projective curve. The following theorem is one of the main goals in the study of Part II–III.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 12.2) *The tuples* $\bigl(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S\bigr)$ *and* $(S_u(E,P), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S)$ $(P \in X - D)$ *are polarized mixed twistor structure.* ▮

We use Theorem 1.1 by taking the associated graded objects. We have the associated graded vector bundle $V^{(0)} := S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$, on which we have the naturally induced filtration $W^{(0)}$, the nilpotent maps $\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}$ and the pairing $S^{(0)}$. Then the tuple $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ is again a polarized mixed twistor structure. We can take an appropriate torus action on the tuple, and thus it is a polarized Hodge structure. Moreover, it can be shown that $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ is a nilpotent orbit. Since the nilpotent orbit was studied very closely in the theory of variation of Hodge structures, we can say that we understand the tuple $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ very well, due to the classical results on variation of Hodge structures. Much information on the tuple $\bigl(S^{\mathrm{can}}, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S\bigr)$ can be obtained from $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$. For example, we can obtain the compatibility of the nilpotent maps and vanishing cycle theorem. We can also apply the lemmas due to Kashiwara and Saito on the nilpotent orbit to $\bigl(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S\bigr)$. In this sense, the study of tame harmonic bundle is reduced to the study of variation of Hodge structures.

In the previous paper [38], we often used the argument to take a 'limit' of a sequence of tame harmonic bundles. For example, we consider the morphisms ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_m : X - D \longrightarrow X - D$ given by $(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \longmapsto (z_1^m, \ldots, z_n^m)$, and we consider the sequence $\bigl\{\psi_m^{*}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)\bigr\}$ of harmonic bundles. Under the assumption that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is nilpotent and with trivial parabolic structure, we obtained the complex variation of Hodge structure as the 'limit'. We also considered the morphisms ${}^{\underline{1}}\psi_m : X - D \longrightarrow X - D$ given by $(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \longmapsto (z_1^m, z_2, \ldots, z_n)$, and we used a limit of the sequence $\bigl\{{}^{\underline{1}}\psi_m^{*}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)\bigr\}$ to derive a sequential compatibility of the residues.

The argument to take a limit does not work if the residues of the Higgs field is not nilpotent. In the case of the example in the subsubsection 1.3.2, we have ${}^{\underline{1}}\psi_m^{*}\theta = m \cdot \alpha \cdot dz/z$, and thus it is not easy to guess what is 'limit' for $m \to \infty$.

In a sense, taking the associated graded tuple $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ corresponds to taking a 'limit'. Let us consider the case that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is nilpotent and with trivial parabolic structure. As is already mentioned, we obtain the limiting CVHS $(E^{(\infty)}, \overline{\partial}_{E^{(\infty)}}, \theta^{(\infty)}, h^{(\infty)})$ as a limit. Then it is easy to see that the limiting mixed twistor structure $(E^{(\infty)}, \overline{\partial}_{E^{(\infty)}}, \theta^{(\infty)}, h^{(\infty)})$ is naturally isomorphic to the associated graded mixed twistor structure $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}\bigr)$.

Most of our argument to take a limit in the previous paper [38] can be replaced with the argument to consider the associated graded tuple. The only exception is the proof of the constantness of the filtration, for which we use some elementary calculus instead of taking a limit.

Remark 1.4 *As is mentioned above, we do not use the argument to take a limit in this paper. However, it seems significant to observe that CVHS appears as the limit.* ▮

1.4 On the purpose 2

1.4.1 Pure twistor D-module and Sabbah's program

The author thinks that we have already understood the asymptotic behaviour of tame harmonic bundle pretty well. In Part IV, we would like to apply the study in Part II–III to the theory of pure twistor D-modules of Sabbah.

Following Simpson's Meta-Theorem, it is interesting and natural to ask whether we can construct the theory of "twistor module", which should be a generalization of the theory of Hodge module of Saito. In this direction, Sabbah has already done a remarkable work ([43]). He gave a definition of regular pure twistor D-modules and proved a decomposition theorem. The motivation of Sabbah is to attack a conjecture of Kashiwara, so that we recall a part of the conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1 (The regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture)

(Push-forward) *Let X and Y be a quasi projective manifold over the complex number field $\boldsymbol{C}$. Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be a proper morphism. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a semisimple regular holonomic D-module on X.*

- *Then the push-forward $Rf_+\mathcal{F}$ is isomorphic to the direct sum $\bigoplus R^i f_+\mathcal{F}$ in the derived category of cohomologically holonomic complexes on Y.*
- *The hard Lefschetz theorem for $\bigoplus R^i f_+\mathcal{F}$ holds.*
- *Each $R^i f_+\mathcal{F}$ is semisimple.*

(Vanishing cycles) *Let X be a quasi projective manifold, and $\mathcal{F}$ be a semisimple regular holonomic D-module on X. Let f be a holomorphic function on X. We take the nearby cycle functor and the vanishing cycle functor along f. Then the associated graded object with respect to the monodromy weight filtration is semisimple.* ▮

Remark 1.5 *The conjecture of Kashiwara is stronger than the statement above. In fact, he conjectured that the statement is true for semisimple holonomic D-modules which are not necessarily regular. See* [28] *for more precise.* ▮

Sabbah's program to attack the conjecture is as follows:

Step 1. To establish the correspondence of tame harmonic bundle and semisimple local system.

Step 2. To give a definition of regular pure twistor D-module and to prove the decomposition theorem for regular pure twistor D-module.

Step 3. To establish the correspondence of tame harmonic bundles and regular pure twistor D-modules.

As for Step 1, there is known the classical result of Corlette who proved that semisimple local system on a projective manifold corresponds to a harmonic bundle. The result was generalized by Jost-Zuo, who proved there exists a pluri-harmonic metric on a semisimple local system on a quasi projective manifold, in other words, there exists the structure of harmonic bundle on any semisimple local system on a quasi projective manifold. It is refined in [39], and we know that a flat bundle (E, ∇) on a quasi projective manifold is semisimple if and only if there exists a tame pure imaginary pluri-harmonic metric on (E, ∇). Hence we can say that the Step 1 is established.

As is already remarked, Sabbah established the step 2 in [43]. Sabbah also proved that a harmonic bundle, without singularity, gives a regular pure twistor D-module for the step 3. As a corollary of the results due to Corlette and himself, Sabbah obtained the decomposition theorem and the hard Lefschetz theorem for semisimple local system.

Remark 1.6

- *After the author submitted the first version of this paper to math arXiv, Sabbah kindly informed on the revision* [43] *of his paper* [42]*, although we mainly refer* [42] *in this paper.*
- *The definition of pure twistor D-module in* [43] *is more general than that given in* [42]*, and it is most appropriate for attacking Kashiwara's conjecture. But it can also be said that it is slightly narrow from the view point of Simpson's Meta Theorem. See Appendix.*
- *Although Sabbah discusses the pure twistor D-modules which are not necessarily regular, we consider only regular pure twistor D-modules in this paper, even if we omit to distinguish "regular".* ▮

1.4.2 The goal of the part IV, the conjectures of Sabbah and Kashiwara

Let X be a complex manifold. Let Z be an irreducible closed subset of X. A tame harmonic bundle generically defined on Z is defined to be a tame harmonic bundle defined over a smooth Zariski open subset of Z. The purpose of the part IV is to establish the step 3, namely we will prove that a tame harmonic bundle generically defined on Z gives the pure twistor D-module of weight 0. More precisely, we will prove the following correspondence:

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 19.1, Theorem 19.4) *We have the bijective correspondences:*

$$\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w) \simeq \mathrm{MPT}(Z,w), \qquad {\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}}^{pi}(Z,w) \simeq \mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z,w).$$

(See the subsubsection 19.1.2 *for the notation.)* ▮

Recall that Saito established the following correspondence.

Proposition 1.7 (Saito, [46]) *Variations of pure polarized Hodge structures of weight w which are defined over Zariski open subsets of Z correspond to pure polarized Hodge modules of weight w whose strict supports are Z.* ▮

Theorem 1.2 is a natural generalization of Proposition 1.7. Once we have established the resemblance of the asymptotic behaviours of tame harmonic bundles and CVHS, we can use a part of Saito's idea to prove Theorem 1.2. In fact, it can be said that the crucial ideas can be found in the subsections 3.19–3.21 of [46]. However, it is not so clear for the author how to modify the arguments in 3.1–3.5 and the most part of 3.b of [46] for our purpose. Hence we will go along the other route.

Sabbah conjectured that every semisimple regular holonomic D-module on a complex projective manifold underlies a pure imaginary pure twistor D-module. (See the section 4.2.c in[43] or the subsection 19.6.) Once Theorem 1.2 and Step 1 above are established, it is easy to show that his conjecture is true. Namely we obtain the following theorem. (See the subsubsection 19.1.2 and the subsection 19.6 for the notation.)

Theorem 1.3 (The conjecture of Sabbah, Theorem 19.5) *The map $\Xi_{Dol} : \mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z,0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHD}^{ss}(Z)$ is surjective.* ▮

As a result, we obtain the regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture, combining the results of Sabbah ([43]) and us.

Corollary 1.1 *Conjecture* 1.1 *is true.* ▮

Remark 1.7 *K. Vilonen informed the author of the work of D. Gaitsgory* [17]*, who proved de Jong's conjecture. Since V. Drinfeld proved that de Jong's conjecture implies the regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture* [16]*, Conjecture* 1.1 *has been established also by their works.* ▮

1.5 The outline of the paper

1.5.1 Part I, Section 2

The Part I is a preparation for the subsequent parts. The author expects that the readers can skip Part I until they need it.

In the section 2, we prepare some notation and lemmas from several areas. In the subsection 2.1, we prepare the notation of some sets and the functions. The maps κ_c and ν_c in the subsubsection 2.1.5 are used to describe the descent of sections for ramified covering. The maps $\mathfrak{k}$, $\mathfrak{e}$, and $\mathfrak{p}$ in the subsubsection 2.1.6 are used for the control of the KMS-structure of tame harmonic bundles.

In the subsection 2.2, we recall the prolongment of a holomorphic vector bundle with a hermitian metric over $X - D$ to an $\mathcal{O}_X$-sheaf on X. Here X denotes a complex manifold, and D denotes a normal crossing divisor. We see when the prolonged sheaf is locally free (Lemma 2.4).

In the subsection 2.3, we prepare something on the μ_c-equivariant holomorphic bundles. It will be useful when we consider the descent of holomorphic bundle.

In the subsection 2.4, we give a lemma for pluri-subharmonic function and convexity. It will be used in the proof of preliminary constantness of the filtrations in the subsubsection 12.2.4. Although the argument is elementary, it is one of the key steps. Hence we give some detail.

In the subsection 2.5, we consider the distributions given by a polynomials of logarithmic functions. The result will be used when we calculate the specialization of the sesqui-linear pairing of the $\mathcal{R}$-triples obtained from tame harmonic bundle (the subsubsection 18.5.1).

In the subsection 2.6, we mainly give some lemmas on a metrics on a finite dimensional vector space. They are used in the subsection 7.1 and the subsection 8.2. The notation $\mathbb{E}_\epsilon$ ($\epsilon > 0$) is introduced. We also recall the relation between the norm of isomorphism and the distance of the hermitian metrics. The result will be used in the subsection 7.7.

In the subsection 2.7, we recall two kinds of lemmas for the acceptable bundles. One is the vanishing of the higher cohomology groups (Lemma 2.30 and corollary 2.7). The other is corollary 2.6, which controls the estimate of the increasing order of holomorphic sections.

In the subsection 2.8, we give a lemma for a complex of Hilbert space bundles over the disc (Lemma 2.41). It will be used to obtain a locally free prolongment of the deformed holomorphic bundle of tame harmonic bundle (the subsection 8.7). Although the procedure is standard, we have to care the infinite dimensionality, and we do not know an appropriate reference. Thus we give some detail. We also recall a standard lemma for embeddings of Sobolev spaces, which will be used in the subsection 2.9.

In the subsection 2.9, we give an estimate of Higgs field of harmonic bundle. In the subsection 2.10, we give an improvement of the convergency of a sequence of harmonic bundles, which was given in our previous paper [38]. Since we do not use an argument to take a limit, the reader can skip the subsection 2.10.

In the subsection 2.11, we recall the relation of Higgs field and a twisted map associated with the flat λ-connection with a hermitian metric. It will be used in the subsubsection 8.1.3.

1.5.2 Section 3

Following Simpson, we give some detail on the relation of Hodge structure and twistor structure. In the subsection 3.1, we introduce some terminology and the notation.

In the subsection 3.2, we recall the equivalence of the category of equivariant holomorphic vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ and the category of bi-filtered vector space. The equivalence is compatible with real structures.

In the subsection 3.3, we give the concrete description of the Tate objects, the objects $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ in the category of twistor structures. In particular, we give the isomorphism $\iota_{(p,q)} : \sigma^*\mathcal{O}(p,q) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(q,p)$. The isomorphism is fixed in the sequel. We also compare $\mathbb{T}(n)$ with the Tate objects in the Hodge theory.

In the subsection 3.4, we recall the equivalence of the category of polarized pure Hodge structures and the category of equivariant polarized pure twistor structures. We also introduce polarized mixed twistor structure, and we see the equivalence of the category of polarized mixed Hodge structures and the category of equivariant polarized mixed twistor structures. Note that our choice of the signature of the nilpotent maps is different from that in the standard Hodge theory.

In the subsection 3.5, we recall the variation of twistor structures, or more generally, the variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles. An example given in the subsubsection 3.5.3 is important for our understanding of the harmonic bundles. We also see the equivalence of the category of variation of Hodge and the category of the variation of equivariant pure twistor structures, which is compatible with some additional structures.

In the subsection 3.6, we introduce the twistor nilpotent orbit. We see that it is a generalization of nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory (Proposition 3.2).

In the subsection 3.7, we see that a split polarized mixed twistor structure gives a nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory (Corollary 3.14). Since we can pick an appropriate torus action on the split polarized mixed twistor structure, we can regard it as a split polarized mixed Hodge structure. Thus the result may be known in the Hodge theory, probably. However it is very important for our application, and hence we give some detail. In particular, we can always obtain the nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory from a polarized mixed twistor structure, by taking the associated graded object. This is one of the key steps to reduce our study of tame harmonic bundle to the classical study of Hodge structures.

In the subsection 3.8, we see that the polarized mixed twistor structure $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ induces the polarized structure on the primitive part $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(V)$ (Proposition 3.5). By using the result, we see that the tuple of nilpotent maps $\boldsymbol{N}$ is strongly sequentially compatible (Lemma 3.75).

In the subsection 3.9, we translate some results known for the Hodge structure, due to Kashiwara, Kawai and Saito, to the results for the twistor structure (Proposition 3.6, Corollary 3.16, Proposition 3.9 and Lemma 3.93). They are crucial for our study to relate tame harmonic bundles and pure twistor D-modules.

In the subsection 3.10, we give the concrete correspondence of the twistor structure in the sense of Simpson and those in the sense of Sabbah.

1.5.3 Section 4

We give some definition of the compatibility of decompositions, filtrations and nilpotent maps. Although we refer the definition of 'sequential compatibility' and 'strongly sequential compatibility' from our previous paper [38], we do not use the lemmas in [38] essentially.

In the subsection 4.1, we give definitions of the compatibility of filtrations and decompositions on a vector space. In the subsection 4.2, we give definitions of the compatibility of filtrations and decompositions on a vector bundle. In the subsection 4.3, we give definitions of the compatibility of filtrations, decompositions and nilpotent maps.

In the subsection 4.4, we give some lemmas for extending a splitting given on a divisor. In the subsection 4.5, we give definitions of compatibility of decompositions, filtrations and nilpotent maps given on divisors. By using the result in the subsection 4.4, we see the existence of splitting.

1.5.4 Section 5

We consider a compatible tuple of filtrations on a discrete valuation ring R, such that the splitting is given on the generic point. We assume that some nice property holds on a generic point K. we also assume the nice property holds on the associated graded vector bundle on R. Under such assumptions, we see that the nice property holds on R.

In the subsection 5.1, we discuss the sequential compatibility of the nilpotent maps. In the subsection 5.2, we discuss the strictness of the morphism with the filtrations.

The results in the section 5 will be very useful, when we combine them with the limiting mixed twistor theorem. Briefly and imprecisely speaking, we can derive some information for the associated graded bundle of the parabolic filtrations. Then we can obtain the information of the original bundle by using the results in the section 5.

1.5.5 Section 6

We give easy and basic examples of harmonic bundles on a punctured disc, which we call model bundles. They are fundamental for the study of the asymptotic behaviour. In a sense, the study of the asymptotic behaviour of general tame harmonic bundles can be reduced to these basic examples. The author apologizes that we use the notation introduced in the section 11. We also refer the subsection 3.2 in [38] for model bundles, although some constants in [38] are different from those in this paper.

1.5.6 Part II, Section 7

In Part II, we discuss the prolongment of the deformed holomorphic bundle of tame harmonic bundle.

In the section 7, we recall the result of Simpson on the study of tame harmonic bundles over the punctured disc, with minor generalization. They play the fundamental role in the study of tame harmonic bundles on a higher dimensional complex manifold.

In the subsection 7.1, we give some detail on Simpson's Main estimate, that is, the estimate on the norm of Higgs field around the singularity. Since we would like to use the result in the higher dimensional case, we clarify the dependence of the constants. We also see the asymptotic orthogonality of the generalized eigen decomposition.

In the subsection 7.2, we recall the results on the prolongment of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ for a fixed λ. We introduce the KMS-structure of the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, and we see the functoriality of the structure. In particular, we give some detail on the functoriality for pull backs via the ramified covering. It will be useful for the study in the higher dimensional case.

In the subsection 7.3, we recall the basic comparison due to Simpson. As a result, the KMS-structure at λ can be controlled by the KMS-structure at 0, and we see that the weight filtration at λ is equivalent to that at 0. We also obtain a rough relation of the frame at λ and the frame at 0, which will be used to show the asymptotic orthogonality.

In the subsection 7.4, we give some detail on the space $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ of the multi-valued flat sections of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. We introduce the KMS-structure of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, and we compare it with the KMS-structure of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. In the subsubsection 7.4.10, we introduce the notion of 'generic' with respect to the KMS-structure. In the subsubsection 7.4.11, we see that the prolongment by an increasing order is equivalent to the quasi canonical prolongment, if λ is generic. In this sense, the prolongment for generic λ is canonically given, even if we forget the metric h.

In the subsection 7.5, we consider the family of the spaces $\big\{H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\,\big|\,\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}\big\}$. We introduce the decomposition $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ which are defined on a neighbourhood of $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$.

In the subsection 7.6, we see the asymptotic orthogonality of the generalized eigen decomposition, the parabolic filtration, and the weight filtration. They are used in the proof of the limiting mixed twistor theorem in the case of curves (the subsection 12.1). The asymptotic orthogonality of the generalized eigen decomposition is also used for the local prolongment of $\mathcal{E}$ (the subsection 8.7).

In the subsection 7.7, we give a maximum principle for the distance of the harmonic metrics on a punctured disc. The result will be used to show a characterization of tameness in the subsubsection 8.1.3.

1.5.7 Section 8

We give some detail on the prolongment of the deformed holomorphic bundles of the tame harmonic bundle on $\Delta^{*}\times\Delta^{n-l}$. The section is one of the hearts of this paper.

In the subsection 8.1, we give the remark on the constantness of the KMS-spectrum. We also see that the tame harmonic bundle of rank one is very easy to understand. We use the facts without mention. In the subsubsection 8.1.3, we give a simple characterization of tameness (Corollary 8.1), which is useful when we check the tameness of a harmonic bundle. (See the subsubsection 19.2.1).

In the subsection 8.2, we give the estimate of the Higgs bundle around the singularity in the higher dimensional case. Since we see the dependence of the constants closely in the subsection 7.1, the argument for the generalization to the higher dimensional case is elementary. As a consequence, we see that the tame harmonic bundle is acceptable. Thus we can apply the result in the subsection 2.7.

In the subsubsection 8.3, we give the prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ in the case that λ is generic. In this case, the situation is very easy. We see that the quasi canonical prolongment gives the prolongment by an increasing order in that case. Note that the direction of the argument is reverse to those in the one dimensional case. The results are used in the next subsections.

In the subsection 8.4, we see the extension property of sections of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ defined over a hyperplane, by using the result in the subsection 2.7. The argument is essentially given in our previous paper [38]. However it is one of the most technical parts for the prolongment, and hence we give some detail. In the subsubsection 8.4.1, we give estimates of Higgs fields by using the results in the subsection 2.9. For a holomorphic section on a hyperplane, we construct a cocycle in the subsubsection 8.4.2. By using the estimate in the subsubsection 8.4.1, we give an estimate of the cocycle. The extension property is stated in the subsubsection 8.4.3, and it is proved in the subsubsection 8.4.4. We use the result in the subsection 2.7. In the subsubsection 8.4.5, we also state the extension property in the codimension one. Since this is the easier case, we give only an indication of the proof.

In the subsections 8.5 and 8.6, we show that the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is locally free. As a preliminary, we show the claim under the assumption as in Lemma 8.37 in the subsection 8.5, by using the result in the subsection 8.4. Then we show the claim without the assumption in the subsection 8.6. We also see that the parabolic structures of the divisors give the compatible tuple of the filtrations. For that purpose, we consider the pull back of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ via the ramified covering $\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ for an appropriate $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{l}$ in the subsubsection 8.6.2. Due to the result in the subsection 8.5, the prolongment of the pull back is locally free. Moreover we have the action of the finite abelian group, which induces the decompositions on the divisors. Due to the result in the subsection 7.2, we see that the decompositions give the splittings of the parabolic filtrations. In the subsubsection 8.6.3, we take an equivariant frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{\diamond}\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ which is compatible with the decompositions on the divisors. Then we take the descent of $\boldsymbol{v}$. We will see that the descent gives the frame of the prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ by using the result in the subsubsection 7.2, and we will obtain the local freeness of the prolongment.

In the subsection 8.7, we see that the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ is locally free on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. First we show the extension property of holomorphic sections. For that purpose, we use the asymptotic orthogonality (the subsection 8.7) and the trivialization given by the argument in the subsection 2.8. Once the extension property is shown, it is easy to show the local freeness.

In the subsection 8.8, we see some structures induced on the divisors. In particular, we obtain the filtrations ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ (the subsubsection 8.8.1) and the decompositions ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ (the subsubsection 8.8.1) of the vector bundle ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. The tuples of the filtrations and the decompositions are compatible. In particular, we obtain the induced vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

In the subsection 8.9, we see that $\bigl\{{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \bigm| \lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\bigr\}$ gives the holomorphic bundle over $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$, and we give some detail on the vector bundle.

1.5.8 Section 9

We give some detail of the KMS-structure on the space of the multi-valued flat sections of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ on $\Delta^{*\,l} \times \Delta^{n-l}$.

In the subsection 9.1, we see some easy properties of the filtrations ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$.

In the subsection 9.2, we show the compatibility of the tuple of the filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{F} \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$. The argument to deal the filtrations is complicated a little, as usual. However it is elementary.

Then we obtain the induced object ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})$. In the subsection 9.3, we see that the family $\bigl\{{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H}) \bigm| \lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\bigr\}$ gives a vector bundle over $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$. We also see some additional structures, the nilpotent maps and the pairing.

1.5.9 Section 10

In the subsection 10.1, we see the compatibility of the naturally defined tuple of the filtrations and the decompositions on ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

In the subsection 10.2, we obtain the filtrations and the decompositions of the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}$. As a result, we obtain the induced object ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}$.

Then we obtain the isomorphisms $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H}) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}}$ and $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,O} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}\times\{P\}} \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}}$, which is described in the subsection 10.3.

1.5.10 Part III, Section 11

In Part III, we prove a limiting mixed twistor theorem. As an application, we obtain the norm estimate for holomorphic sections and multi-valued flat sections.

In the section 11, we give some detail on the construction of the vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ with the nilpotent maps and the pairing, from a tame harmonic bundle.

In the subsection 11.1, we recall the variation of polarized pure twistor structure induced by the harmonic bundles. In particular, we recall about the conjugate of harmonic bundles. The formalism was given by Simpson in [52].

In the subsection 11.2, we see the KMS-structure and the induced objects of the conjugate. Briefly speaking, the conjugate is isomorphic to the dual. However we remark that the signature of the nilpotent maps are reversed.

In the subsection 11.3, we see the construction of the vector bundles $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$. We also see the induced nilpotent maps and the pairings on them. In particular, we obtain the weight filtration W on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$ in the case $\dim(X)=1$.

In the subsection 11.4, we give some detail on the associated graded vector bundles $\mathrm{Gr}^{W} S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^{W} S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$ in the case $\dim(X)=1$, which are simple.

1.5.11 Section 12

We prove the limiting mixed twistor theorem, which will be very important in the study in Part IV. It is also useful to control the conjugacy classes of the nilpotent parts of the residues.

In the subsection 12.1, we prove the limiting mixed twistor theorem in the case $\dim(X)=1$. Although the proof is essentially same as those in [38] and [42], it is rather complicated to state the argument precisely.

In the subsection 12.2, we prove the limiting mixed twistor theorem for higher dimensional case. The different part from that in [38] is the proof of the constantness of the filtrations (Lemma 12.29). In our previous paper [38], we used the argument to take a 'limit'. Instead we use the result in the subsection 2.4.

When we take the associated graded objects of $\bigl(S^{\mathrm{can}}(E), W, \boldsymbol{N}, S\bigr)$, we obtain the nilpotent orbit due to the limiting mixed twistor theorem. In the subsection 12.3, we derive some consequences by using the results for polarized mixed twistor structures (the subsection 3.8) and the results in the section 5. We show the strongly sequential compatibility and some decomposition.

1.5.12 Section 13

As one of the application of the limiting mixed twistor theorem, we give a norm estimate of the holomorphic sections or flat sections of the deformed holomorphic bundles. The arguments are essentially same as those in our previous paper [38]. We have only to care the parabolic structure.

In the subsection 13.1, we give some remark on functoriality for pull backs of deformed holomorphic bundles. In the subsection 13.2, we show a preliminary norm estimate for holomorphic sections. In the subsection 13.3, we derive a norm estimate for holomorphic sections. In the subsection 13.4, we reduce the norm estimate for flat sections to the norm estimate for holomorphic sections. Contrast to the holomorphic case, we do not discuss the norm estimate of the family of flat sections. It seems that we need some additional argument.

1.5.13 Part IV, Section 14

In Part IV, we apply the results in Part II–III to the theory of pure twistor D-modules.

As a preparation, in the section 14, we recall the specialization of $\mathcal{R}$-modules and the sesqui-linear pairings introduced by Sabbah with minor generalization. The author recommends the reader to read the very readable paper [42]. We use some results in [42] without mention.

In the subsection 14.1, we recall the specialization of $\mathcal{R}$-module. Although Sabbah considered only the local unitary case, we give some more general definitions. However, the basic theory of $\mathcal{R}$-modules are established sufficiently generally in [42]. Even if we need a generalization, we need at most minor modification.

In the subsection 14.2, we recall the specialization of the sesqui-linear pairings, with some minor generalization. Again, we need at most minor modification.

Remark 1.8 *Sabbah kindly informed to the author on the revised version* [43] *of his paper, in which the generalization treated in this section is already discussed essentially. We keep this section for our reference in the later sections.* ▮

1.5.14 Section 15

We give the prolongments of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}$ to the $\mathcal{R}$-modules on $\mathcal{X}$.

First we give a naive prolongment ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ in the subsection 15.1. Although it is not coherent, ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ has many nice properties, and it is easy to understand ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ algebraically. We will use ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ as the ambient sheaf. We introduce the sheaf ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$, and we prepare a lemma in the subsubsection 15.1.5, which will be used in the subsection 15.3.

In the subsection 15.2, we give the prolongment $\mathfrak{E}$, which we really need. To understand $\mathfrak{E}$ more closely, we introduce the filtrations ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(I\subset\underline{l})$, and we obtain the sheaves ${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$. In the subsection 15.3, we show ${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$ and ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$ are naturally isomorphic (Lemma 15.33). Although it looks a little long and complicated, the arguments are elementary.

In the subsection 15.4, we show a kind of compatibility of the filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E})$ $(i\in\underline{l})$. First goal is to show ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)={}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$ (Proposition 15.1). Once we prove Proposition 15.1, we can easily translate some nice properties of ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$ to ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)$. In particular, we obtain the strictly S-decomposability of $\mathfrak{E}$ along $z_i=0$ for $i\in\underline{l}$. We also obtain the primitive decomposition of sections of $\mathfrak{E}$.

In the subsection 15.5, we give a characterization of $\mathfrak{E}$ as the prolongment of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}$ obtained from harmonic bundle. It will be useful when we consider the specialization of $\mathfrak{E}$ along $\prod z_i^{m_i}$.

1.5.15 Section 16

We give some detail on the push-forward $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ for the graph of the holomorphic functions $\prod_{i=1} z_i^{m_i}$. Following Saito [46], we introduce the filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ in the subsection 16.1. Our purpose is to show that $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ gives the V-filtration along $t=0$ at λ_0 whose associated graded module is strict, namely, $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ is strictly specializable along t_0. We will also show that the naturally induced filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ gives the V-filtration along $z_i = 0$ at λ_0, whose associated graded module is strict, namely $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is strictly specializable along $z_i = 0$ $(i \in \underline{l})$.

In the subsection 16.2, we give some algorithms to describe sections of $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ in a normal (but not unique) way.

In the subsection 16.3, we obtain the primitive decompositions of sections of $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$. The first goal is Proposition 16.1. Once Proposition 16.1 is established, the rest are rather formal.

We obtain the strict S-decomposability of $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ in the subsection 16.4. Even if it looks complicated, it is a rather formal consequence of the results in the subsection 16.3.

In the subsection 16.5, we would like to see the form of $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ briefly. Since it is not easy to see it directly, we see ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$, instead. Our goal is to relate them with the construction in the subsubsection 3.9.2. Compare the formulas (347) and (59).

1.5.16 Section 17

We consider the nilpotent map $N = t\eth_t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$ on $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$. Then we obtain the weight filtration $W(N)$. We would like to see $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\, \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$. It is not easy to see it directly, we introduce the filtration $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$, such that $\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}$ is a direct sum of the locally free sheaves ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{D}_I$ $(|I| = n - m)$.

In the subsection 17.1, we see the relation of the weight filtration $W(N)$ and the induced filtrations ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$. We also see the decomposition of $P_h\, \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}$. The results easily follow from the limiting mixed twistor theorem and the results in the section 5.

In the subsection 17.2, we introduce the filtration $\mathbb{F}$. We see that the exact sequences associated to $\mathbb{F}$ is strict with respect to the weight filtration $W(N)$. A key observation is given in the proof of Lemma 17.17. As a result, we can understand the filtrations ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ sufficiently well, and we obtain the strictly specializability of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ along $z_i = 0$ $(i \in \underline{n})$.

In the subsection 17.3, we obtain the strict S-decomposability of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ along $z_i = 0$ $(i \in \underline{n})$, by using the results in the previous subsubsections and the lemmas of Kashiwara and Saito prepared in the subsection 3.9. As a result, we obtain the decomposition by the supports, as in Proposition 17.1. We see some properties of the components.

1.5.17 Section 18

In the subsection 18.1, we give the sesqui-linear pairing $\mathfrak{C}$ of $\mathfrak{E}$, which is the unique prolongation of the pairing of $\mathcal{E}$.

In the subsection 18.2, we introduce ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ for $\boldsymbol{u} \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$, which is a family of flat bundles on $(X - D) \times \boldsymbol{C}^*$. We see that the sesqui-linear pairing C_0 of $\mathcal{E}$ induces the pairing on ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. By using it, we obtain the sesqui-linear pairing on ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}'}$ for $\boldsymbol{u}' \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$ in the subsection 18.3. We see that it is essentially obtained by the formalism in the subsection 14.2.

In the subsection 18.4, we compare two $\mathcal{R}$-triples in 0-dimension. One is obtained as the specialization of the $\mathcal{R}$-triple. The other is obtained from the vector bundle constructed in the section 11.

In the subsection 18.5, we show that the component whose support is $\{0\}$ is a polarized pure twistor structure (Corollary 18.4), by using the lemma of Kashiwara in the subsubsection 3.9.2. Once we know Corollary 18.4, we immediately know that the smooth part of the components of $P_h\, \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\, \psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ together with the induced sesqui-linear pairing is a variation of pure twistor structures. By using the characterization of the prolongment, the each components of the decomposition of $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t], \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t], \mathfrak{C})$ is isomorphic to a $\mathcal{R}$-triple obtained from a tame harmonic bundle. As a result, we arrive at the stage we can use an induction to show the existence of the prolongment as the pure twistor D-module.

1.5.18 Section 19

We see the correspondence of tame harmonic bundles and pure twistor D-modules are given. The statement is given in the subsection 19.1.

In the subsection 19.2, we show that every regular pure twistor D-module gives a tame harmonic bundle which is defined on a Zariski open subset of the strict support.

The existence of the prolongment as pure twistor D-module is shown in 19.3. This is a formal consequence of the result in the subsection 18.5.

The uniqueness is shown in the subsection 19.4. We need some consideration by using the uniqueness of the intermediate extension and the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence.

In the subsection 19.5, we see that the correspondence of Theorem 19.1 preserves the pure imaginary property. By the correspondence, we can show that Sabbah's conjecture is true, i.e., semisimple regular holonomic D-modules correspond to pure imaginary pure twistor D-modules. As a result, we obtain the regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture by combining the results of Sabbah and us.

1.5.19 Part V, Appendix

As is noted in the subsubsection 1.4.1, the definition of pure twistor D-module given by Sabbah (see [42] and [43]) is slightly narrow from the view point of Simpson's Meta Theorem, although his definition is natural to attack the conjecture of Kashiwara. Hence we give some minor complement for pure twistor D-modules as an appendix. In particular, we give some detail on the decomposition theorem of the pure twistor D-module on a smooth projective curve.

1.6 Some remarks

1.6.1 On the contents and the length

Although the paper is long, most of the contents are rather standard. It is the intension of the author to organize the facts for our purpose and to give a proof when he does not know an appropriate reference. He does not pretend that most of the contents are original. He just hopes that everything contained in this paper is clear for everyone.

1.6.2 The difference of the version 1 and the version 2

Many typos and arguments are improved. We only refer the main difference.

- Because the paper [39] has been written, the discussion on pure imaginary pure twistor D-module is added. We give the correspondence of semisimple regular holonomic D-modules and of pure imaginary pure twistor D-modules through tame pure imaginary harmonic bundles. Namely, the conjectures of Sabbah and Kashiwara are established. The related part is mainly the subsections 19.5–19.6, and the subsection 20.2.

- The explanation for the tameness of harmonic bundle obtained from a pure twistor D-modules is added. The related part is mainly the subsubsections 2.6.4–2.6.6, the subsection 2.11, the subsection 7.7, the subsubsection 8.1.3, and the subsection 19.2.

1.7 Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to the colleagues in Osaka City University. He specially thanks Mikiya Masuda for his encouragement and supports.

The author thanks Yoshifumi Tsuchimoto and Akira Ishii for their constant encouragements.

The author thanks Tomohide Terasoma who informed various things to the author. He is also grateful to Terasoma's family for their kindness.

The author thanks Masaki Kashiwara for some useful information.

The author thanks Mark Andrea de Cataldo, who attracted the author's attention to Hodge modules and a decomposition theorem of perverse sheaves. The author also thanks his great tolerance for the author's lack of communication ability.

The author thanks Claude Sabbah who kindly informed the revised version of his paper.

The author thanks Kari Vilonen who kindly informed the work of D. Gaitsgory [17].

The author prepared the paper during his stay at the Institute for Advanced Study. The author is sincerely grateful to their excellent hospitality. He also acknowledges National Scientific Foundation for a grant DMS 9729992, although any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

The author thanks the financial supports by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Sumitomo Foundation.

Part I

Preliminary

2 Preliminary

2.1 Notation

2.1.1 Sets

We will use the following notation:

$\mathbb{Z}$:	the set of the integers,	$\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$:	the set of the positive integers,
$\boldsymbol{Q}$:	the set of the rational numbers,	$\boldsymbol{Q}_{>0}$:	the set of the positive rational numbers,
$\boldsymbol{R}$:	the set of the real numbers,	$\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}$:	the set of the positive real numbers,
$\boldsymbol{C}$:	the set of the complex numbers,	$\underline{n}$:	the set $\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$,
$M(r)$:	the set of $r\times r$-matrices,	$\mathcal{H}_r$:	the set of $r\times r$-hermitian matrices,
$\mathfrak{S}_l$:	the l-th symmetric group,		

We denote the set of positive hermitian metric of V by $\mathcal{PH}(V)$. We often identify it with the set of the positive hermitian matrices by taking an appropriate base of V.

2.1.2 A disc, a punctured disc and some products

For any positive number $C>0$ and $z_0\in\boldsymbol{C}$, the open disc $\bigl\{z\in\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,|z-z_0|<C\bigr\}$ is denoted by $\Delta(z_0,C)$, and the punctured disc $\Delta(z_0,C)-\{z_0\}$ is denoted by $\Delta^*(z_0,C)$. When $z_0=0$, $\Delta(0,C)$ and $\Delta^*(0,C)$ are often denoted by $\Delta(C)$ and $\Delta^*(C)$. Moreover, if $C=1$, $\Delta(1)$ and $\Delta^*(1)$ are often denoted by Δ and Δ^*. If we emphasize the variable, we describe as Δ_z, Δ_i. For example, $\Delta_z\times\Delta_w=\{(z,w)\in\Delta\times\Delta\}$, and $\Delta_1\times\Delta_2=\{(z_1,z_2)\in\Delta\times\Delta\}$. We often use the notation $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ to denote the complex planes $\bigl\{\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{\mu\in\boldsymbol{C}\bigr\}$.

Unfortunately, the notation Δ is also used to denote the Laplacian. The author hopes that there will be no confusion.

We put $\overline{\Delta}(C):=\bigl\{z\,\big|\,|z|\leq C\bigr\}$ and $\overline{\Delta}^*(C):=\bigl\{z\,\big|\,0<|z|\leq C\bigr\}$. In the case $C=1$, we use $\overline{\Delta}$ and $\overline{\Delta}^*$ instead of $\overline{\Delta}(1)$ and $\overline{\Delta}^*(1)$.

For a complex manifold X, a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and a positive number ϵ_0, we often consider the product $X\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ and $X\times\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. For simplicity, we denote them by $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ and $\mathcal{X}^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ respectively. We also use the notation $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}^\sharp$ to denote the $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$.

For a complex manifold X, we have the conjugate complex manifold, which is denoted by $X^\dagger$.

2.1.3 Projections

Let I be a finite set and J be a subset of I. In general, $q_J:X^I\longrightarrow X^J$ denotes the naturally induced projection taking the i-th components for $i\in J$. Similarly, $\pi_J:X^I\longrightarrow X^{I-J}$ denotes the projection omitting the j-th component for $j\in J$. However, we will often use π to denote some other projections. If J consists of the unique element j, We often use the notation q_j and π_j instead of $q_{\{j\}}$ and $\pi_{\{j\}}$.

2.1.4 The order on $\boldsymbol{R}^n$

We have the natural order on $\boldsymbol{R}$. Let n be a positive integer. We often use the order on $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ given as follows: For elements $\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$, we say $\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{b}$ if and only if $q_i(\boldsymbol{a})\leq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ for any $i\in\underline{n}$. When we consider such order, we say $\boldsymbol{a}<\boldsymbol{b}$ if and only if $q_i(\boldsymbol{a})<q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ for any $i\in\underline{n}$, and we say $\boldsymbol{a}\lneq\boldsymbol{b}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b}$.

2.1.5 κ_c and ν_c

Let c be a real number. The maps $\kappa_c:\boldsymbol{R}\longrightarrow]c-1,c]$ and $\nu_c:\boldsymbol{R}\longrightarrow\mathbb{Z}$ are defined by the following condition:

> For a real number $x\in\boldsymbol{R}$, the equality $\kappa_c(x)+\nu_c(x)=x$ holds.

In the case $c=0$, we use the notation κ and ν instead of κ_c and ν_c.

Let S be a finite subset of $]-1,0]$ and b be a positive number. We obtain the map $\phi_b:S\longrightarrow\mathbb{Z}$ given by $\phi_b(x)=\nu(b\cdot x)$.

Definition 2.1 *A real number b is sufficiently large with respect to S, if the map ϕ_b is injective.* $\blacksquare$

2.1.6 $\mathfrak{p}$, $\mathfrak{e}$ and $\mathfrak{k}$

For any element $u=(a,\alpha)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$, we put as follows:

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u):=a+2\cdot\mathrm{Re}(\lambda\cdot\bar{\alpha}),$$

$$\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u):=\alpha-a\cdot\lambda-\bar{\alpha}\cdot\lambda^2.$$

Then we obtain the following morphism:

$$\mathfrak{k}(\lambda)=\big(\mathfrak{p}(\lambda),\mathfrak{e}(\lambda)\big):\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}.$$

The following lemma is checked by a direct calculation.

Lemma 2.1 *$\mathfrak{k}(\lambda)$ is bijective.*

Proof Let us consider the equation $\mathfrak{p}\big(\lambda,(a,\alpha)\big)=A$ and $\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,u\big)=B$ for $(B,A)\in\boldsymbol{C}\times\boldsymbol{R}$. Then we have the unique solution:

$$\alpha=\frac{\lambda\cdot A+B}{|\lambda|^2+1},\quad a=\frac{(-|\lambda|^2+1)A-2\,\mathrm{Re}(\lambda\overline{B})}{|\lambda|^2+1}.$$

It may be useful to use the relation $\lambda\cdot\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,(a,\alpha))+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,(a,\alpha))=(|\lambda|^2+1)\cdot\alpha$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 2.1 *We will use Lemma 2.1 to control the KMS-structure of the prolongment of deformed holomorphic bundles.* $\blacksquare$

For any element $u=(\alpha,a)\in\boldsymbol{C}\times\boldsymbol{R}$, we put $u^{\dagger}=(\overline{\alpha},-a)\in\boldsymbol{C}\times\boldsymbol{R}$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let u be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}\times\boldsymbol{R}$. We have the following formula:*

$$-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{p}\big(-\overline{\lambda},u^{\dagger}\big),\qquad\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}=\mathfrak{e}\big(-\overline{\lambda},u^{\dagger}\big).\tag{1}$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. $\blacksquare$

For any element $u=(a,\alpha)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$, we put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u):=\mathrm{Re}\big(\lambda\cdot\overline{\alpha}+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\alpha\big)=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)+\mathrm{Re}\big(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big),\\&\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u):=\exp\big(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\cdot(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\alpha-a-\lambda\cdot\overline{\alpha})\big)=\exp\big(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big).\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Lemma 2.3 *Let u be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. We have the following formula:*

$$\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{e}^f\bigl(\lambda^{-1},u^{\dagger}\bigr)^{-1},\quad \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\lambda^{-1},u^{\dagger}\bigr).$$

Proof We have the following equalities:

$$\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)=\exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}(\lambda^{-1}\alpha-a-\lambda\bar{\alpha})\bigr)=\mathfrak{e}^f\bigl(\lambda^{-1},u^{\dagger}\bigr)^{-1}.$$

We also have the following equalities:

$$\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u)=\mathrm{Re}\bigl(\lambda\bar{\alpha}+\lambda^{-1}\alpha\bigr)=\mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\lambda^{-1},u^{\dagger}\bigr).$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Notation To denote the element $(1,0)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$, we often use the notation $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0$. We often identify $(\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C})^I$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^I\times\boldsymbol{C}^I$.

For any element $\boldsymbol{u}=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{b})\in\boldsymbol{C}^l\times\boldsymbol{R}^l$, we put $\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}:=(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}},-\boldsymbol{b})$.

2.2 Prolongation by an increasing order

2.2.1 Notation

Let X be a complex manifold and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i$ be a normal crossing divisor. Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle with a hermitian metric h over $X-D$.

Let U be an open subset of X, which is admissible with respect to D, i.e., we have a coordinate $(z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ satisfying the following:

$$D\cap U=\bigcup_{k=1}^{l}(D_{i_k}\cap U),\quad D_{i_k}=\{z_k=0\}.$$

For any section $f\in\Gamma\bigl(U\cap(X-D),E\bigr)$, let $|f|_h$ denote the norm function of f with respect to the metric h. We describe $|f|_h=O\bigl(\prod_{i=1}^l|z_k|^{-b_k}\bigr)$, if there exists a positive number C such that $|f|_h\leq C\cdot\prod_{k=1}^l|z_k|^{-b_k}$.

Recall that '$-\mathrm{ord}(f)\leq\boldsymbol{b}$' means the following:

$$|f|_h=O\Bigl(\prod_{k=1}^{l}|z_k|^{-b_k-\epsilon}\Bigr)\text{ for any positive number }\epsilon.$$

For any $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^N$, the sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}E$ is defined as follows:

$$\Gamma(U,{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}E):=\bigl\{f\in\Gamma\bigl(U\cap(X-D),E\bigr)\bigm|-\mathrm{ord}(f)\leq\boldsymbol{b}\bigr\}.$$

The sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}E$ is called the prolongment of E by an increasing order $\boldsymbol{b}$. In particular, we use the notation ${}^{\diamond}E$ in the case $\boldsymbol{b}=(0,\ldots,0)$.

2.2.2 Adaptedness and adaptedness up to log order

Let X be a C^{∞}-manifold, and E be a C^{∞}-vector bundle with a hermitian metric h. Let $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_1,\ldots,v_r)$ be a C^{∞}-frame of E. We obtain the $\mathcal{H}(r)$-valued function $H(h,\boldsymbol{v})$, whose (i,j)-component is given by $h(v_i,v_j)$. Recall that the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ is called adapted, if $H(h,\boldsymbol{v})$ and $H(h,\boldsymbol{v})^{-1}$ are bounded.

Let $E=\bigoplus_i E_i$ be a C^{∞}-decomposition of E. The hermitian metric h of E induces the metric h_i on E_i. Then we obtain the metric $\bigoplus_i h_i$ of E.

Definition 2.2 *The decomposition $E=\bigoplus_i E_i$ is quasi adapted with respect to h, if h and $\bigoplus_i h_i$ are mutually bounded.* ∎

Let us consider the case $X=\Delta^{*\,l}\times\Delta^{n-l}$. We have the coordinate $(z_1,\ldots,z_n)$. Let E, h and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be as above.

Definition 2.3 *A frame* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *is called adapted up to log order, if the following inequalities hold over* X*, for some positive numbers* C_i $(i = 1, 2)$ *and* M*:*

$$0 < C_1 \cdot \Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l} \log |z_i|\Bigr)^{-M} \leq H(h, \boldsymbol{v}) \leq C_2 \cdot \Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l} \log |z_i|\Bigr)^{M}.$$

▮

2.2.3 Lemmas for local freeness and the parabolic filtration

We put $X := \Delta^n$ and $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$, where $D_i = \bigl\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in X \bigm| z_i = 0\bigr\}$. Let E be a holomorphic bundle over $X - D$ and h be a hermitian metric of E.

Lemma 2.4 *We assume that we have a holomorphic frame* $\boldsymbol{v} = \bigl(v_j \bigm| j = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{rank}(E)\bigr)$ *of* E *satisfying the following conditions:*

- *There exists* $b_i(v_j) \in]-1, 0]$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq \mathrm{rank}(E)$ *and for* $1 \leq i \leq l$*.*
- *The* C^∞*-frame* $\boldsymbol{v'} = \bigl(v'_j \bigm| j = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{rank}(E)\bigr)$*, given as follows, is adapted up to log order.*

$$v'_j := v_j \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{b_i(v_j)}.$$

Then the following holds:

1. *The* $\mathcal{O}_X$*-sheaf* ${}^\diamond E$ *is locally free.*
2. *Each* v_i *is a section of* ${}^\diamond E$*, and* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *gives a frame of* ${}^\diamond E$*.*

Proof It is easy to see that v_j are sections of ${}^\diamond E$. Let f be a section of ${}^\diamond E$ over an open subset of $U \subset X$. We have the following development on U:

$$f = \sum f_j \cdot v_j = \sum f_j \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{-b_i(v_j)} \cdot v'_j.$$

Here f_j are holomorphic functions on $U \cap (X - D)$. Since $\boldsymbol{v'}$ is adapted up to log order, we have the following estimate:

$$\Bigl| f_j \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{-b_i(v_j)} \Bigr| = O\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{-\epsilon}\Bigr), \quad \text{for any positive number } \epsilon.$$

In fact, the left hand side can be dominated by a polynomial of $-\log |z_i|$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$. Hence we obtain the following estimate, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|f_j| = O\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{b_i(v_j) - \epsilon}\Bigr).$$

Note that $b_i(v_j) - \epsilon > -1$ for any sufficiently small positive number ϵ. Hence the functions f_j are holomorphic on U. Thus $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}^\diamond E$, and ${}^\diamond E$ is locally free. ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$ denote the element $(\overbrace{0, \ldots, 0}^{i-1}, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. For any real number $b \leq 0$, we have the natural morphism ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}E \longrightarrow {}^\diamond E$. Thus we have the parabolic filtration ${}^iF$ on D_i given as follows:

$${}^iF_b := \mathrm{Im}\bigl({}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}E_{|D_i} \longrightarrow E_{|D_i}\bigr).$$

Lemma 2.5 *We impose the same assumption in Lemma* 2.4*. Then the following holds.*

- *For each i, ${}^{i}F$ is a filtration in the category of vector bundles on D_i, namely the associated graded sheaf ${}^{i}\operatorname{Gr}^{F}$ is locally free on D_i.*
- *The tuple of the filtrations $\big({}^{i}F \,\big|\, i = 1,\dots,l\big)$ is compatible, in the sense of Definition 4.17.*
- *We have ${}^{i}\deg^{F}(v_j) = b_i(v_j)$.*

Proof Let f be a section of ${}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}E$, we have the description $f = \sum f_j \cdot v_j$ for some holomorphic functions f_j. By an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4, we obtain the vanishing $f_{j\,|\,D_i} = 0$ in the case $b_i(v_j) > b$.

Thus ${}^{i}F_b$ is the vector subbundle of ${}^{\diamond}E_{|D_i}$ generated by v_i such that $b_i(v_j) \leq b$. It implies all the claims. ▮

2.3 A preliminary for μ_c-equivariant bundle

2.3.1 The action of the group μ_c

For any positive integer c, we put $\mu_c := \big\{z \in \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, z^c = 1\big\}$. We pick a generator $\omega(c)$ of μ_c. For any element $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1,\dots,c_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$, we put $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}} := \prod_{i=1}^{m} \mu_{c_i}$. We denote the element $\big(\overbrace{1,\dots,1}^{i-1},\omega(c_i),1,\dots,1\big)$ by $\omega(c_i)$ for simplicity. We have the natural inclusion $\mu_{c_i} \longrightarrow \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$. The image is also denoted by μ_{c_i}

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} D_i$ for some $l \leq n$. We have the natural G_m^n-action on X, given by the componentwise multiplication. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$. If we take a homomorphism $\rho : \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}} \longrightarrow G_m^n$, we obtain the $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action ρ on X. In the following, we consider only such $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-actions on X.

2.3.2 An equivariant section and an equivariant lift

Let ρ be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let E be a ρ-equivariant holomorphic vector bundle on X.

Definition 2.4 *A section f of E is called ρ-equivariant, if there exists a homomorphism $\chi : \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^*$ such that $g^*(f) = \chi(g)\cdot f$ for any element $g \in \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$.* ▮

Let $\Gamma(X,E)$ denote the space of holomorphic sections of E over X. We have the natural $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on $\Gamma(X,E)$. Since $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ is a finite group, we have the canonical decomposition:

$$\Gamma(X,E) \simeq \bigoplus_{\eta \in Rep(\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}})} Hom\big(V_\eta, \Gamma(X,E)\big) \otimes V_\eta.$$

Here $\operatorname{Rep}(\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}})$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of the irreducible representations of $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and V_η ($\eta \in \operatorname{Rep}(\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}})$) denotes an irreducible representation corresponding to η. Then a section $f \in \Gamma(X,E)$ is equivariant if and only if f is contained in one of the components in the canonical decomposition.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. We put $D_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} D_i$.

Lemma 2.6 *Let f_0 be a holomorphic equivariant section of $E_{|D_I}$, i.e., there exists a homomorphism $\chi : \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^*$ such that $g^*(f_0) = \chi(g)\cdot f_0$ for any $g \in \mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$. Then there exists a holomorphic equivariant section f of E on X satisfying $f_{|D_I} = f_0$ and $g^*(f) = \chi(g)\cdot f$.*

Proof We have the equivariant surjection $\Gamma(X,E) \longrightarrow \Gamma(D_I, E_{|D_I})$. Since $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ is finite, we have the canonical decompositions of $\Gamma(X,E)$ and $\Gamma(D_I, E_{|D_I})$. Then we obtain the surjections of the components of the canonical decompositions. Hence we are done. ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_i)$ be an equivariant base of $E_{|O}$, i.e., there exist $\chi_i : G \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^*$ such that $g^*(u_i) = \chi_i(g)\cdot u_i$ for each i.

Corollary 2.1 *There exists an equivariant frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of E on a neighbourhood of O, such that $g^*(v_i) = \chi_i(g)\cdot v_i$ and $v_{i\,|\,O} = u_i$.* ▮

Definition 2.5 *A frame as in Corollary 2.1 is called an equivariant frame.* ▮

Lemma 2.7 *Let E_j $(j=1,2)$ be $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-vector bundles over X, and $\pi : E_1 \longrightarrow E_2$ be equivariant surjection. Let N be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-subbundle of E_2 and M be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-subbundle of $E_{1\,|\,D}$. Assume that the restriction of $\pi_{|D}$ to M gives an isomorphism of M and $N_{|D}$.*

Then there exists a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-subbundle $\widetilde{M}$ of E_1 defined around O satisfying the following:

- *The restriction of $\pi_{|D}$ to $\widetilde{M}$ gives an isomorphism of $\widetilde{M}$ and N.*

Such $\widetilde{M}$ is called an equivariant lift of N extending M.

Proof We have the following exact sequence:

$$\Gamma(E_1) \longrightarrow \Gamma(E_2) \oplus \Gamma(E_{1\,|\,D}) \longrightarrow \Gamma(E_{2\,|\,D}) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{3}$$

Since $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ is finite, $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-vector spaces in the complex (3) have the canonical decomposition. On each component of the canonical decomposition, the complex is exact.

Let take an equivariant frame $\boldsymbol{v}_N$ of N on a neighbourhood of O. By using an isomorphism $\pi_{|D} : M \longrightarrow N_{|D}$, we take an equivariant frame $\boldsymbol{v}_M$ of M around O such that $\pi_{|D}(\boldsymbol{v}_M) = \boldsymbol{v}_{N|D}$. By using the equivariant exact sequence (3), we can take an equivariant sections $v_{\widetilde{M},i}$ of $\widetilde{M}$ around O such that $\pi(v_{\widetilde{M},i}) = v_{N,i}$ and $v_{\widetilde{M},i\,|\,D} = v_{M,i}$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}_{\widetilde{M}} := (v_{\widetilde{M},i})$ gives a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-subbundle $\widetilde{M}$ of E_1, which has desired properties. ▮

2.3.3 Compatible frames

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i = \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. Let V be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-vector bundle on X. Assume that we are given $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-subbundles $H_I \subset V_{|D_I}$ for any subset $I \subset \underline{n}$, satisfying $H_{I'\,|\,D_I} \supset H_I$ $(I' \subset I)$.

Lemma 2.8 *Let v be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-equivariant section of $H_{\underline{l}}$. Then there exists a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-equivariant section $\tilde{v}$ of V on a neighbourhood of $D_{\underline{n}}$, satisfying $\tilde{v}_{|D_I} \in H_I$ and $\tilde{v}_{|D_{\underline{l}}} = v$.*

Proof We construct $\tilde{v}_{|D_I}$ descending inductively on $|I|$. Assume that we have already took $\tilde{v}_{|D'_I}$ for any $I' \supsetneq I$. We put $\partial D_I := \bigcup_{I' \supsetneq} D_{I'}$. Then $\tilde{v}_{|\partial D_I}$ is an equivariant section of $H_{I\,|\,\partial D_I}$. By an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 2.6, we can extend it to an equivariant section $\tilde{v}_{|D_I}$ of H_I. Thus the inductive construction can proceed. ▮

Let S be a set. For any subset $I \subset \underline{n}$, we have the set $S^I := \{f : I \longrightarrow S\}$. For any pair $I \subset I'$, we have the naturally defined projection $q^I : S^{I'} \longrightarrow S^I$. Let us consider decompositions $V = \bigoplus_{u \in S^I} {}^I U_s$. We denote the tuple $\bigl({}^I U_s \bigm| s \in S^I\bigr)$ by ${}^I U$. We assume the following, for any subset $I \subset \underline{n}$ and for any element $u \in S^I$:

$${}^I U_{s\,|\,D_{I'}} = \bigoplus_{q_I(u')=u} {}^{I'} U_{u'}.$$

Lemma 2.9 *Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be an equivariant frame of $V_{|D_{\underline{l}}}$ compatible with ${}^{\underline{n}}U$. Then we have an equivariant frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ of V on a neighbourhood of $D_{\underline{n}}$, satisfying that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{|D_{\underline{n}}} = \boldsymbol{v}$ and that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{|D_I}$ is compatible with ${}^I U$.*

Proof From any element $u \in S^{\underline{l}}$, we obtain the elements $q_I(u) \in S^I$. Then we obtain the subbundles ${}^I U_{q_I(u)} \subset V_{|D_I}$. Hence we can take a tuple of sections $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ satisfying that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{|D_{\underline{n}}} = \boldsymbol{v}$ and that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{|D_I}$ is compatible with ${}^I U$, by using Lemma 2.8. On a neighbourhood of $D_{\underline{n}}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame. ▮

2.4 Some very elementary preliminary for convexity

2.4.1 Preliminary

Let T^n be an n-dimensional torus, i.e., $T^n = \bigl\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \boldsymbol{C}^n \bigm| |z_i| = 1\bigr\}$. We use the coordinate $z_i = \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\theta_i\bigr)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are linearly independent over $\boldsymbol{Q}$. Let us consider the morphism $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} : \boldsymbol{R} \longrightarrow T^n$, given as follows:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(x) = \bigl(\exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\alpha_i \cdot x\bigr) \bigm| i = 1, \ldots, n\bigr).$$

Let f be an $\boldsymbol{R}$-valued function on T^n. Then we have the Fourier decomposition of f:

$$f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n} a_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\exp\Bigl(\sqrt{-1}\cdot\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\cdot\theta_i\Bigr).$$

Here m_i denotes the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{m}$, and $a_{\boldsymbol{m}}$ are complex numbers. Since f is $\boldsymbol{R}$-valued, we have the relation $\overline{a}_{\boldsymbol{m}}=a_{-\boldsymbol{m}}$. Thus we have the following equality:

$$f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}\frac{1}{2}\Bigl(a_{\boldsymbol{v}}\cdot\exp\Bigl(\sqrt{-1}\sum m_i\cdot\theta_i\Bigr)+\overline{a}_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\exp\Bigl(-\sqrt{-1}\sum m_i\cdot\theta_i\Bigr)\Bigr).$$

In the following, we put $\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\cdot\alpha_i$. Then we have the following:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(f)(x)=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}\frac{1}{2}\Bigl(a_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x\bigr)+\overline{a}_{\boldsymbol{m}}\exp\bigl(-\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x\bigr)\Bigr).$$

Let $b_{\boldsymbol{m}}$ and $c_{\boldsymbol{m}}$ denote the real part and the imaginary part of $a_{\boldsymbol{m}}$ respectively. Then we obtain the following:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(f)(x)=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n} b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\cos\bigl(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x\bigr)-\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}_n} c_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\sin\bigl(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x\bigr).$$

Lemma 2.10 *We have the finiteness* $\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\infty$.

Proof We put $\mathbb{Z}^*:=\mathbb{Z}-\{0\}$. We have the natural inclusion ${\mathbb{Z}^*}^I\longrightarrow\mathbb{Z}^n$. Let T_I be the sub-torus of T^n determined by the condition $z_j=1$ for any $j\in\underline{n}-I$. Then the restriction $f_{|T_I}$ is C^∞. Hence we have the following:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in{\mathbb{Z}^*}^I}\prod_{i\in I}|m_i|^2\cdot|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|^2<\infty.$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in{\mathbb{Z}^*}^I}|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in{\mathbb{Z}^*}^I}\prod_{i\in I}|m_i|^{-2}\Bigr)\cdot\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in{\mathbb{Z}^*}^I}\prod_{i\in I}|m_i|^2\cdot|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|^2\Bigr)<\infty.$$

On the other hand, we have the following:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|=\sum_{I\subset\underline{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in{\mathbb{Z}^*}^I}|a_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\infty.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Corollary 2.2 *We have* $\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}|b_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\infty$ *and* $\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}|c_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\infty$. ▮

Lemma 2.11 *We have the following equalities:*

$$\int_{-N}^{N}1\cdot\frac{dx}{2N}=1,\qquad\int_{-N}^{N}\cos(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)\cdot\frac{dx}{2N}=\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha})},\qquad\int_{-N}^{N}\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)\cdot\frac{dx}{2N}=0.$$

Proof It can be checked by direct calculations. ▮

We put as follows:

$$\Xi_N(f):=\int_{-N}^{N}\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(f)\cdot\frac{dx}{2N}.$$

Lemma 2.12 *We have the following equality:*

$$\Xi_N(f)=b_0+\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\neq 0}\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha})}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}.$$

Proof We have the following:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(f)=\lim_{M\to\infty}\Big(\sum_{|\boldsymbol{m}|\leq M} b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\cos(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)-\sum_{|\boldsymbol{m}|\leq M} c_{\boldsymbol{m}}\cdot\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)\Big).$$

Due to Corollary 2.2, we can change the order of the integral and the summation. Thus we obtain the following:

$$\Xi_N(f)=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^n}\Big(\int_{-N}^{N}\cos(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)\frac{dx}{2N}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}-\int_{-N}^{N}\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot x)\frac{dx}{2N}\cdot c_{\boldsymbol{m}}\Big).$$

Thus we obtain the result. ∎

Lemma 2.13 *When $N\to\infty$, the sequence of the numbers $\{\Xi_N(f)\}$ is convergent. We put $\Xi(f):=\lim_{N\to\infty}\Xi_N(f)$. Then we have $\Xi(f)=b_0$.*

Proof We have only to show the following:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\Big(\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\neq 0}\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\Big)=0.$$

We have the following inequality:

$$\left|\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\right|\leq|b_{\boldsymbol{m}}|.$$

We also have $\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\neq 0}|b_{\boldsymbol{m}}|<\infty$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\Big(\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\neq 0}\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\Big)=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}\neq 0}\Big(\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{\sin(\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot N)}{N\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\cdot\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\cdot b_{\boldsymbol{m}}\Big)=0.$$

Thus we are done. ∎

The morphism $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ induces the morphism $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}\longrightarrow T^n\times\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}$, which we denote also by $\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. Let f be an $\boldsymbol{R}$-valued C^∞-function on $T^n\times\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}$. Then we have the Fourier decomposition as before:

$$f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}a_{\boldsymbol{m}}(y)\cdot\exp\Big(\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}m_i\cdot\theta_i\Big).$$

Pick $y\in\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}$. Then we put as follows:

$$\Xi_N(f)(y):=\int_{-N}^{N}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}f)(x,y)\frac{dx}{2N}.$$

We have the limit $\Xi(f)(y):=\lim_{N\to\infty}\Xi_N(f)(y)$, and thus we obtain the functions $\Xi(f),\Xi_N(f):\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}$. If we decompose $a_{\boldsymbol{m}}(y)$ into the real part $b_{\boldsymbol{m}}(y)$ and the imaginary part $c_{\boldsymbol{m}}(y)$, then we have $\Xi(f)(y)=b_0(y)$. In particular, $\Xi(f)$ is C^∞ and we have the following:

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\Big)^l\Xi(f)=\frac{d^l b_0(y)}{dy^l}=\Xi\Big(\frac{\partial^l f}{\partial y^l}\Big).$$

2.4.2 Convexity

We continue to use the setting in the subsubsection 2.4.1. We put $F:=\psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(f)$.

Lemma 2.14 *Assume F is subharmonic, i.e., the following inequality holds:*

$$-\frac{\partial^2F}{\partial x^2}-\frac{\partial^2F}{\partial y^2}\leq 0.$$

Then we have the following convexity of $\Xi(f)$:

$$-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\Xi(f)\leq 0.$$

Proof We have the following equality:

$$-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\Xi(f) = \Xi\Big(-\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}\Big) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\int_{-N}^{N}\Big(-\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2}\Big)\frac{dx}{2N}.$$

We have the following inequality due to the subharmonicity of F:

$$\int_{-N}^{N}\Big(-\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2}\Big)\frac{dx}{2N} \leq \int_{-N}^{N}\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2}\frac{dx}{2N} = \frac{1}{2N}\Big(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(N,y) - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(-N,y)\Big).$$

Let V denote the vector field on T^n, given as follows:

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_i\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}.$$

Then we have the following equality:

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = \psi_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{-1}(Vf).$$

If we fix y, then Vf is bounded function on a compact set T^n, and thus $\partial F/\partial x$ is a bounded function on $\boldsymbol{R}$. Hence we have the following:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{2N}\Big(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(N,y) - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(-N,y)\Big) = 0.$$

Thus we obtain the result. ∎

2.4.3 An elementary boundedness of a convex function

Lemma 2.14 will be used in the proof of preliminary constantness of the filtration in the subsubsection 12.2.4, together with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.15 *Let* $f : \boldsymbol{R}_{\geq 1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ *be a* C^∞*-function. Assume the following:*

1. $-\dfrac{d^2 f}{dy^2} \leq 0$.
2. *There exist positive numbers* C_1 *and* C_2 *such that* $f \leq C_1 + C_2 \cdot \log y$.

Then there exists a positive number C_3 *such that* $f \leq C_3$.

Proof Due to the condition 1, the function f is convex below. On the other hand, the right hand side in the condition 2 is convex above. They imply that f is dominated by a constant. ∎

2.5 An elementary remark on some distributions

2.5.1 Some integrals

In this subsubsection, ϕ denotes a C^∞-function on $\boldsymbol{R}$ whose support is compact. We denote the differential $\frac{d\phi}{dr}$ by ϕ'. We put as follows:

$$L_n := \frac{(\log r^2)^n}{n!}.$$

Lemma 2.16 *We have the following equality:*

$$\int_0^\infty \phi\cdot L_n\cdot r^{2s-1}\cdot dr = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{n}(-s)^{-i-1}\int_0^\infty \phi'\cdot L_{n-i}\cdot r^{2s}dr. \tag{4}$$

Proof We have the following equality:

$$L_n \cdot r^{2s-1} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dr}\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{n}(-1)^i \cdot s^{-i-1} L_{n-i} \cdot r^{2s}\Big).$$

Then (4) immediately follows. ▮

Since ϕ' is C^∞ around $r=0$, $\int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_k r^{2s} \cdot dr$ gives a entire function for the variable s around $s=0$.

Lemma 2.17 *We have the following Taylor development at $s=0$:*

$$\int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_k \cdot r^{2s} \cdot dr = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} s^l \left(\begin{array}{c} k+l \\ l \end{array}\right) \cdot \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_{k+l} \cdot dr. \tag{5}$$

Proof We have the following:

$$\frac{1}{l!}\left(\frac{d}{ds}\right)^l \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_k \cdot r^{2s} \cdot dr = \frac{1}{l!}\int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot \frac{(\log r^2)^{k+l}}{k!} r^{2s} dr = \left(\begin{array}{c} k+l \\ l \end{array}\right) \cdot \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_{k+l} \cdot r^{2s} dr.$$

Then (5) immediately follows. ▮

Lemma 2.18 *We have the following equality:*

$$\int_0^\infty \phi \cdot L_n \cdot r^{2s-1} \cdot dr = \frac{(-1)^n}{2} \cdot s^{-n-1} \cdot \phi(0) + \sum_{l=n+1}^{\infty} X_{n,l} \cdot s^{l-n-1} \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_l \cdot dr. \tag{6}$$

Here we put as follows:

$$X_{n,l} := \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2} \sum_{h=0}^{n} (-1)^h \left(\begin{array}{c} l \\ h \end{array}\right) \in \boldsymbol{R}. \tag{7}$$

Proof We have the following:

$$\int \phi \cdot L_n \cdot r^{2s-1} \cdot dr = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{n}(-s)^{-i-1}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} s^l \cdot \left(\begin{array}{c} n-i+l \\ l \end{array}\right) \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_{n-i+l} \cdot dr. \tag{8}$$

By putting $h=n-i$ and $m=n-i+l$, the right hand side can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\substack{h+l=m \\ h\le n}} (-1)^{-n+h-1} \cdot s^{-n+m-1} \cdot \left(\begin{array}{c} m \\ n \end{array}\right) \cdot \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_m \cdot dr \\ &\qquad = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\Big(\sum_{\substack{h+l=m \\ h\le n}} (-1)^h \left(\begin{array}{c} m \\ n \end{array}\right)\Big) \cdot (-1)^{n-1} s^{-n+m-1} \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_m \cdot dr. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The term $m=0$ is as follows:

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot (-1)^{n-1} s^{-n-1} \cdot \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot dr = \frac{(-1)^n}{2} \cdot s^{-n-1} \cdot \phi(0).$$

It is easy to see that the terms $1 \le m \le n$ vanish. Then we obtain (6). ▮

Corollary 2.3 *We have the following development:*

$$\int \phi \cdot L_n \cdot r^{2ms-1} dr = \frac{(-1)^n}{2}(ms)^{-n-1} \cdot \phi(0) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{l=n+1}^{\infty} X_{n,l} \cdot (m \cdot s)^{l-n-1} \int_0^\infty \phi' \cdot L_k \cdot dr.$$

Here $X_{n,l}$ is given in (7). ▮

Corollary 2.4 *Let ϕ be a test function the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}$. We have the following formula:*

$$\mathrm{Res}_{s=0}\int \phi\cdot L_n(|z|^2)\cdot|z|^{2s-2}\cdot\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi}dz\wedge d\bar{z}=\begin{cases}1 & (n=0),\\ 0 & (n\neq 0)\end{cases}$$

∎

2.5.2 Some distributions

In this subsubsection ϕ denotes a test function on $\boldsymbol{C}^n$. Let us consider the function Φ on $\boldsymbol{C}^{*\,n}$ of the following form:

$$\Phi=\sum_{k=1}^{N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S}s^k\cdot a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}L_{n_i}(|z_i|)^{n_i}.$$

Here S denotes a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^n$, $a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}$ denote complex numbers, and n_i $(i=1,\ldots,n)$ denote the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{n}$. We have the distribution $\hat{\Phi}$ defined as follows:

$$\hat{\Phi}(\phi):=\mathrm{Res}_{s=0}\int_{\boldsymbol{C}^n}\Phi\cdot\phi\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i\cdot s-2}\cdot\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi}dz_i\wedge d\bar{z}_i.$$

Lemma 2.19 *Assume that the support of the distribution $\hat{\Phi}$ is contained in $\{O\}$. Then we have the following formula:*

$$\hat{\Phi}(\phi)=\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in S_1}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot(-1)^{\sum n_i}\cdot\phi(0)\cdot\prod m_i^{-n_i-1}.$$

Here S_1 denotes the set of the elements $(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in S\times\mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $\sum n_i=k-n+1$.

Proof We have only to consider the test functions of the form $\phi(z_1,\ldots,z_n)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}\phi_i(z_i)$. Note the following equality:

$$\int\Phi\cdot\phi\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_is-2}\cdot\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi}dz_i\wedge d\bar{z}_i=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S}s^k\cdot a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot 2^n\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}\int_0^{\infty}\phi_i\cdot L_{n_i}\cdot r_i^{2m_is-1}dr_i.$$

We have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}&\prod_{i=1}^{n}\int_0^{\infty}\phi_i\cdot L_{n_i}\cdot r_i^{2m_is-1}dr_i\\ &\quad=\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\prod_{i\in I}m_i^{-n_i-1}\cdot s^{-|\boldsymbol{n}|-n}\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\Big(\frac{(-1)^{n_i}}{2}\phi_i(0)\Big)\cdot\prod_{j\in J}\Big(\sum_{l_j=n_j+1}^{\infty}X_{n_j,l_j}\cdot(m_j\cdot s)^{l_j}\cdot\int_0^{\infty}\phi'\cdot L_{l_j}\cdot dr\Big)\\ &\qquad=\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\prod_{i\in I}m_i^{-n_i-1}\cdot\prod_{j\in J}m_j^{l_j}\cdot s^{-|\boldsymbol{n}|-n+|\boldsymbol{l}|}\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\Big(\frac{(-1)^{n_i}}{2}\phi_i(0)\Big)\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^J}\prod_{j\in J}X_{n_j,l_j}\cdot\int\phi_j'\cdot L_{l_j}\cdot dr_j\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

Here we put $|\boldsymbol{n}|=\sum_{i=1}^{n}n_i$ and $|\boldsymbol{l}|=\sum_{j\in J}l_j$. We put as follows:

$$A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},I,J,\boldsymbol{l}):=\prod_{i\in I}m_i^{-n_i-1}\cdot\prod_{j\in J}m_j^{l_j}\cdot\prod_{j\in J}X_{n_j,l_j}\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\frac{(-1)^{n_i}}{2}\in\boldsymbol{R}.$$

In the case $I=\underline{n}$, we have the following equality:

$$A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},\underline{n},\emptyset,0)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}m_i^{-n_i-1}\cdot(-1)^{|\boldsymbol{n}|}\cdot 2^{-n}.$$

Then the right hand side can be rewritten as follows:

$$\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^J} A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},I,J,\boldsymbol{l})\cdot s^{-|\boldsymbol{n}|-n+|\boldsymbol{l}|}\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\phi_i(0)\cdot\prod_{j\in J}\int\phi'_j\cdot L_{l_j}dr_j.$$

We have the following:

$$\operatorname{Res}_{s=0}s^k\prod_{i=1}^n\int\phi_i\cdot L_{n_i}\cdot r_i^{2m_is-1}dr_i=\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in S(\boldsymbol{n},n,k)}A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},I,J,\underline{l})\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\phi_i(0)\cdot\prod_{j\in J}\int\phi'_j\cdot L_{l_j}\cdot dr_j.$$

Here we put $S(\boldsymbol{n},n,k):=\bigl\{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^J_{\geq 0}\bigm| -|\boldsymbol{n}|-n+|\boldsymbol{l}|+k=-1\bigr\}$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Phi}(\phi)=\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},k}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in S(\boldsymbol{n},n,k)}A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},I,J,\boldsymbol{l})\cdot\prod_{i\in I}\phi_i(0)\cdot\prod_{j\in J}\int\phi'_j\cdot L_{l_j}\cdot dr_j\\=\sum_{I\sqcup J=\underline{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^J}Y(I,J,\boldsymbol{l})\prod_{i\in I}\phi_i(0)\cdot\prod_{j\in J}\int\phi'_j\cdot L_{l_j}\cdot dr_j\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Here we put as follows:

$$Y(I,J,\boldsymbol{l})=\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},k}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot A(\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{n},I,J,\boldsymbol{l})\in\boldsymbol{R}.$$

Note the tuple $\bigl\{\prod_{j\in J}L_{l_j}\bigm|\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^J_{>0}\bigr\}$ of C^∞-functions on $\boldsymbol{C}^{*\,J}$ is linearly independent over $\boldsymbol{R}$. Since we have assumed that the support of $\hat{\Phi}$ is contained in $\{O\}$, we obtain the vanishings of the constants $Y(I,J,\boldsymbol{l})$ $(J\neq\emptyset)$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\hat{\Phi}(\phi)=\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in S_1}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot 2^n\cdot 2^{-n}\cdot(-1)^{|\boldsymbol{n}|}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^n m_i^{-n_i-1}\phi_i(0)=\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in S_1}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot(-1)^{|\boldsymbol{n}|}\cdot\phi(0)\cdot\prod_{i=1}^n m_i^{-n_i-1}.$$

Then we obtain the result. ∎

2.6 Some preliminary from elementary linear algebra

2.6.1 The generalized eigen decomposition

Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over $\boldsymbol{C}$, and f be an endomorphism of V. We often denote the set of eigenvalues of f by $\mathcal{S}p(f)$. For any element $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(f)$, we denote the generalized eigenspace corresponding to α by $\mathbb{E}(f,\alpha)$. We often denote it by $\mathbb{E}(\alpha)$ or $\mathbb{E}(V,\alpha)$, if there are no confusion. Note the compatibility of the filtration and the generalized eigen decomposition.

Lemma 2.20 *Let V be a finite dimensional vector space, and f be an endomorphism of V. Let F be a filtration of V such that f preserves F. Then the generalized eigen decomposition of f and F is compatible.*

Proof If a subspace W of V is preserved by f, then we have $W=\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(f)}W\cap\mathbb{E}(f,\alpha)$. Then the lemma immediately follows. ∎

2.6.2 A lemma for the boundedness of the hermitian metrics

Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over $\boldsymbol{C}$ and h be a hermitian metric of V. Let $S\subset\boldsymbol{C}$ be a finite subset. Let η be a positive number such that $B_a(\eta)\cap B_b(\eta)=\emptyset$ for $a\neq b\in S$. Then we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C):=\bigl\{f\in End(V)\bigm||f|_h\leq C,\ \mathcal{S}p(f)\subset\bigcup_{a\in S}B_a(\eta)\bigr\}.\tag{12}$$

Lemma 2.21 *The subset $\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C)\subset End(V)$ is compact.*

Proof Due to the condition $|f|_h \leq C$, the set $\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C)$ is bounded. We also have the closedness of the defining condition of $\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C)$. ▮

For any $f \in \mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C)$, we have the decomposition of V:

$$V = \bigoplus_{a\in S} \mathbb{E}_{\eta}(f,a), \quad \mathbb{E}_{\eta}(f,a) := \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(f),\\ |\alpha-a|<\eta}} \mathbb{E}(f,\alpha).$$

Then we obtain the hermitian metric $h(f)$ given as follows:

$$h(f) := \bigoplus_{a\in S} h_{|\mathbb{E}_{\eta}(f,a)}.$$

Lemma 2.22 *The set* $\bigl\{h(f)\,\big|\,f\in\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,m,C)\bigr\}$ *is compact.*

Proof It immediately follows from the compactness of $\mathcal{S}(S,\eta,C)$ ▮

2.6.3 A lemma for ϵ-orthogonality

Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over $\boldsymbol{C}$. Let S be a finite set, and $V=\bigoplus_{a\in S}V_a$ be a decomposition. Let h be a hermitian metric of V.

Definition 2.6 *Let ϵ be a positive number such that $\epsilon \leq 1$. The decomposition $V=\bigoplus_{a\in S}V_a$ is called ϵ-orthogonal, if the inequalities $|h(u,v)|\leq \epsilon\cdot|u|_h\cdot|v|_h$ hold for any elements $u,v\in V$.* ▮

Assume the following:

- There exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that the following holds for any element $v=\sum_{a\in S}v_a$ of V:
$$C_1\cdot\sum|v_b|_h \leq |v|_h \leq C_2\cdot\sum|v_b|_h.$$
- We assume that the decomposition $V=\bigoplus_{a\in S}V_a$ is ϵ-orthogonal with respect to h.

Let g be an element of $\bigoplus_{a\in S}End(V_a)$, and $g^{\dagger}$ be the adjoint of g with respect to h. We have the decomposition:

$$g^{\dagger}=\sum (g^{\dagger})_{a\,b}, \qquad (g^{\dagger})_{a\,b}\in Hom(V_a,V_b).$$

Lemma 2.23 *There exists a positive constant C such that the following holds:*

- *C is independent of ϵ.*
- *The inequalities $\bigl|(g^{\dagger})_{a\,b}\bigr|_h \leq C\cdot\epsilon\cdot|g|_h$ hold for any elements $g\in\bigoplus_{a\in S}End(V_a)$ and for any $a\neq b\in S$.*

Proof Let v be an element of V_a. We put $w_b := g^{\dagger}_{a\,b}(v)$. Let u be an element of V_c for $c\neq a$. Then we have the following equality:

$$\bigl(v,g(u)\bigr)_h = \bigl(g^{\dagger}(v),u\bigr)_h = \sum (w_b,u)_h.$$

Hence we have the following:

$$(w_c,u)_h = \bigl(v,g(u)\bigr)_h - \sum_{b\neq c}(w_b,u)_h.$$

Then we obtain the following due to the ϵ-orthogonality:

$$|(w_c,u)_h| \leq \epsilon\cdot|v|_h\cdot|g|_h\cdot|u|_h + \sum_{b\neq c}\epsilon\cdot|w_b|_h\cdot|u|_h \leq \epsilon\cdot|v|_h\cdot|g|_h\cdot|u|_h + \epsilon\cdot C_1^{-1}|g^{\dagger}(v)|_h\cdot|u|_h$$
$$\leq \epsilon\cdot\bigl(1+C_1^{-1}\bigr)|v|_h\cdot|g|_h\cdot|u|_h. \quad (13)$$

In particular, we consider the case $u = w_c$:

$$|w_c|_h \leq \epsilon \cdot \bigl(1 + C_1^{-1}\bigr) \cdot |v|_h \cdot |g|_h$$

Then we obtain the following inequality for any $v \in V_a$:

$$|g^{\dagger}_{a\,c}(v)|_h \leq \epsilon \cdot \bigl(1 + C_1^{-1}\bigr) \cdot |v|_h \cdot |g|_h.$$

It implies the claim. ■

2.6.4 Norm of endomorphisms

Let V be an r-dimensional vector space, and h be a hermitian metric of V. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a base of V. We put $H := H(h, \boldsymbol{v})$. Let f be an endomorphism of V, and then we have the matrix A such that $f \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot A$. Let $f^{\dagger}$ denote the adjoint of f with respect to the metric h. Then we have $f^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot {}^t\overline{A} \cdot \overline{H}$.

We have the norm $|f|_h$ of f with respect to the metric h.

Lemma 2.24 *The following holds:*

$$|f|_h^2 = \operatorname{tr}\bigl(A \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot {}^t\overline{A} \cdot \overline{H}\bigr).$$

Proof We have $|f|_h^2 = \operatorname{tr}(f \cdot f^{\dagger})$. Then the claim immediately follows. ■

2.6.5 The $GL(r)$-invariant metric

Let $\mathcal{PH}(r)$ denote the set of $(r \times r)$-positive definite hermitian matrices. We have the standard left action κ of $GL(r)$ on $\mathcal{PH}(r)$:

$$GL(r) \times \mathcal{PH}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{PH}(r), \quad (g, H) \longmapsto \kappa(g, H) = g \cdot H \cdot {}^t\bar{g}.$$

For any point $H \in \mathcal{PH}(r)$, the tangent space $T_H\mathcal{PH}(r)$ is naturally identified with the vector space $\mathcal{H}(r)$. Let I_r denote the identity matrix. We have the positive definite metric of $T_{I_r}\mathcal{PH}(r)$ given by $(A, B)_{I_r} = \operatorname{tr}(A \cdot B) = \operatorname{tr}(A \cdot {}^t\bar{B})$. It is easy to see the metric is invariant with respect to the $U(r)$-action on $T_{I_r}\mathcal{PH}(r)$.

Let H be any point of $\mathcal{PH}(r)$ and let g be an element of $GL(r)$ such that $H = g \cdot {}^t\bar{g}$. Then the metric of $T_H\mathcal{PH}(r)$ is given as follows:

$$(A, B)_H = \bigl(\kappa(g^{-1})_* A, \kappa(g^{-1})_* B\bigr)_{I_r} = \operatorname{tr}\Bigl(g^{-1}A{}^t\bar{g}^{-1} \cdot g^{-1}B{}^t\bar{g}^{-1}\Bigr) = \operatorname{tr}\bigl(H^{-1}AH^{-1}B\bigr). \tag{14}$$

Since $(\cdot, \cdot)_{I_r}$ is $U(r)$-invariant, the metric $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ on $T_H\mathcal{PH}(r)$ is well defined. Thus we have the $GL(r)$-invariant Riemannian metric of $\mathcal{PH}(r)$.

It is well known that $\mathcal{PH}(r)$ with the metric above is a symmetric space with non-positive curvature. We denote the induced distance by $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}$. We often use the simple notation d to denote $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}$, if there are no confusion.

Let X be a manifold, and $\Psi : X \longrightarrow \mathcal{PH}(r)$ be a differentiable map. Let P be a point of X, and v be an element of the tangent space T_PX.

Lemma 2.25 *We have the following formula:*

$$\bigl|d\Psi(v)\bigr|^2_{T_{\Psi(P)}\mathcal{PH}(r)} = \operatorname{tr}\Bigl(\Psi(P)^{-1} \cdot d\Psi(v) \cdot \Psi(P)^{-1} \cdot d\Psi(v)\Bigr) = \operatorname{tr}\Bigl(\overline{\Psi(P)}^{-1} \cdot \overline{d\Psi(v)} \cdot \overline{\Psi(P)}^{-1} \cdot \overline{d\Psi(v)}\Bigr).$$

Proof It follows from (14). ■

2.6.6 Comparison of the norm and the distance

For any elements H_1 and H_2 of $\mathcal{PH}(r)$, we have an element $g \in GL(r)$ such that $\kappa(g, H_1) = I_r$ and that $\kappa(g, H_2)$ is the diagonal matrix. The set of the eigenvalues of $\kappa(g, H_2)$ is independent of a choice of g. Let $e^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, e^{\alpha_r}$ be the eigenvalues of $\kappa(g, H_2)$. We put as follows:

$$\delta(H_1, H_2) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} \Big(\frac{e^{\alpha_i} - e^{-\alpha_i}}{2} \Big)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand, we have the distance $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(H_1, H_2) = \big(\sum \alpha_i^2 \big)^{1/2}$.

For any real number R, we put as follows:

$$C(R) := \frac{e^R - e^{-R}}{2R}.$$

If $0 \leq x \leq R$, we have $x \leq C(R) \cdot x$. We also note that $C(R) \to 1$ when $R \to 0$.

Lemma 2.26

- *We have the inequality:*
$$d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(H_1, H_2) \leq \delta(H_1, H_2).$$
- *If $d(H_1, H_2) \leq R$, we have the inequality:*
$$\delta(H_1, H_2) \leq C(R) \cdot d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(H_1, H_2).$$

Proof It can be checked elementarily. ▮

We reformulate Lemma 2.26 as follows: Let V be an r-dimensional vector space, and let h_1 and h_2 be hermitian metrics of V. The identity map induces the map $\Phi : (V, h_1) \longrightarrow (V, h_2)$. We have the norms $|\Phi|$ and $|\Phi^{-1}|$.

Lemma 2.27

- *The following inequality holds:*
$$d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(h_1, h_2)^2 \leq \frac{|\Phi|^2 + |\Phi^{-1}|^2 - 2r}{4}.$$
- *If $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(h_1, h_2) \leq R$, the following inequality holds:*
$$\frac{|\Phi|^2 + |\Phi^{-1}|^2 - 2r}{4} \leq C(R)^2 \cdot d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}(h_1, h_2)^2.$$

Proof If we take an appropriate base of V, h_1 and h_2 are represented by the identity matrix I_r and the diagonal matrices whose diagonal entries are $e^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, e^{\alpha_r}$. It is easy to check that $|\Phi|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} e^{2\alpha_i}$ and $|\Phi^{-1}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} e^{-2\alpha_i}$. Then it immediately follows $4^{-1}\big(|\Phi|^2 + |\Phi^{-1}|^2 - 2r\big) = \delta(H_1, H_2)^2$. Thus the claims follow from Lemma 2.26. ▮

2.7 Preliminary from complex differential Geometry

2.7.1 Some results of Andreotti-Vesentini

We recall some results of Andreotti-Vesentini in [2]. Let (Y, g) be a complete Kahler manifold, not necessarily compact. We denote the natural volume form of Y by dvol. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ be a hermitian holomorphic bundle over Y. The hermitian metric h and the Kahler metric g induces the fiberwise hermitian metric of $E \otimes \Omega_Y^{p,q}$, which we denote by $(\cdot,\cdot)_{h,g}$. The space of C^{∞} (p,q)-forms with compact support is denoted by $A_c^{p,q}(E)$. For any $\eta_1,\eta_2 \in A_c^{p,q}(E)$, we put as follows:

$$\langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_h = \int (\eta_1,\eta_2)_{h,g} \cdot \mathrm{dvol}, \quad ||\eta||_h^2 = \langle \eta, \eta \rangle_h.$$

The completion of $A_c^{p,q}(E)$ with respect to the norm $||\cdot||_h$ is denoted by $A_h^{p,q}(E)$.

We have the operator $\overline{\partial}_E : A_c^{p,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_c^{p,q+1}(E)$, and the formal adjoint $\overline{\partial}_E^* : A_c^{p,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_c^{p,q-1}(E)$. We use the notation $\Delta'' = \overline{\partial}_E^*\overline{\partial}_E + \overline{\partial}_E\overline{\partial}_E^*$. We have the maximal closed extensions $\overline{\partial}_E : A_h^{p,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_h^{p,q+1}(E)$ and $\overline{\partial}_E^* : A_h^{p,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_h^{p,q-1}(E)$. We denote the domains of $\overline{\partial}_E$ and $\overline{\partial}_E^*$ by $Dom(\overline{\partial}_E)$ and $Dom(\overline{\partial}_E^*)$ respectively.

Proposition 2.1 (Proposition 5 of [2]) *In* $W^{p,q} := Dom(\overline{\partial}_E) \cap Dom(\overline{\partial}_E^*)$, *the space* $A_c^{p,q}(E)$ *is dense with respect to the the graph norm:* $||\eta||_h^2 + ||\overline{\partial}_E\eta||_h^2 + ||\overline{\partial}_E^*\eta||_h^2$. *(See also* [11]*).* ■

Proposition 2.2 (Theorem 21 of [2]) *Assume that there exists a positive number* $c > 0$ *satisfying the following:*

Then, for any $\eta \in W^{p,q}$, *we have* $||\overline{\partial}_E\eta||_h^2 + ||\overline{\partial}_E^*\eta||_h^2 \geq c \cdot ||\eta||_h^2$.

For any C^{∞}*-element* $\eta \in A_h^{p,q}(E)$ *such that* $\overline{\partial}_E(\eta) = 0$, *we have a* C^{∞}*-solution* $\rho \in A_h^{p,q-1}(E)$ *satisfying the equation* $\overline{\partial}_E(\rho) = \eta$. ■

2.7.2 Kodaira identity

For a Kahler manifold Y, we have the operator $\Lambda : \Omega^{p,q} \longrightarrow \Omega^{p-1,q-1}$ (see 62 page of [32]). For a section f of $End(E) \otimes \Omega_Y^{p_0,q_0}$, we have the natural morphism $A_c^{p,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_c^{p+p_0,q+q_0}(E)$, defined by $\eta \longmapsto f \wedge \eta$. We denote the morphism by $e(f)$.

Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle with a hermitian metric h over Y. We have the metric connection of E induced by the holomorphic structure $\overline{\partial}_E$ and the hermitian metric h. We denote the curvature by $R(h)$.

We have the Levi-Civita connection of the tangent bundle of Y. It induces the connection of $E \otimes \Omega^{0,q}$:

$$\nabla : A_c^{0,0}(E \otimes \Omega^{0,q}) \longrightarrow A_c^{0,1}(E \otimes \Omega^{0,q}) \oplus A_c^{1,0}(E \otimes \Omega^{0,q}).$$

We denote the $(0,1)$-part of ∇ by ∇'' to distinguish with $\overline{\partial}_E : A_c^{0,q}(E) \longrightarrow A_c^{0,q+1}$. The $(1,0)$-part of ∇ is same as ∂ of $E \otimes \Omega^{0,q}$. We denote the curvature of ∇ by $R(\nabla)$.

We have the Laplacian Δ'' on $A_c^{0,q}(E)$ and the equalities of the operators:

$$\Delta'' = \overline{\partial}_E\overline{\partial}_E^* + \overline{\partial}_E^*\overline{\partial}_E = \partial_E\partial_E^* + \partial_E^*\partial_E + \sqrt{-1}\big[e(R(h)), \Lambda\big].$$

In particular, we have the equality $\Delta'' = \partial_E^*\partial_E - \sqrt{-1}\Lambda \circ e(R(h))$ on $A_c^{0,q}(E)$.

On the other hand, we have the following Laplacian on $A_c^{0,0}(E \otimes \Omega^{0,q})$:

$$\Delta'' = \nabla''\nabla''^* + \nabla''^*\nabla'' = \partial_E^*\partial_E - \sqrt{-1}\Lambda \circ e(R(\nabla)).$$

For an element η of $A_c^{0,0}(E \otimes \Omega^{0,q})$, note the following equality:

$$\Lambda \circ e(R(\nabla))(\eta) = \Lambda(R(\nabla)) \cdot \eta.$$

Since we have $R(\nabla) = R(h) + R(\Omega^{0,q})$, we have the following:

$$\Lambda \circ e(R(\nabla))(\eta) = \Lambda(R(h)) \cdot \eta + \Lambda(R(\Omega^{0,q})) \cdot \eta.$$

Then we have the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle \overline{\partial}_E\eta,\ \overline{\partial}_E\eta \big\rangle_h &= \big\langle \partial_E\eta,\ \partial_E\eta \big\rangle_h - \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda(R(h)\cdot\eta),\ \eta \big\rangle_h \\ &= \big\langle \nabla''\eta,\ \nabla''\eta \big\rangle_h + \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda(\Omega^{0,q}) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_h - \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda\big(R(h)\cdot\eta\big) - \Lambda R(h) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_h \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Let χ be a $\boldsymbol{R}$-valued C^{∞}-function. If we put $\tilde{h} := h \cdot e^{-\chi}$, we obtain the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\langle \overline{\partial}_E\eta,\ \overline{\partial}_E\eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} + \big\langle \partial_E\eta,\ \partial_E\eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} \\ &\quad = \big\langle \nabla''\eta,\ \nabla''\eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} + \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda(\Omega^{0,q})\eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} - \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda(R(h)\eta) - \Lambda(R(h)) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} \\ &\qquad + \sqrt{-1}\big\langle \Lambda(\overline{\partial}\partial\chi \cdot \eta) - \Lambda(\overline{\partial}\partial\chi) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_{\tilde{h}}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

2.7.3 Kodaira identity for sections of $A_c^{0,1}(E)$

We denote the Ricci curvature of the Kahler metric g by $\mathrm{Ric}(g)$. We can naturally regard $\mathrm{Ric}(g)$ as a section of $End(E)\otimes\Omega^{1,1}$, by the natural diagonal inclusion $\boldsymbol{C}\longrightarrow End(E)$.

Let f be a section of $End(E)\otimes\Omega_Y^{1,1}$, and η be an element of $A_c^{0,1}(E)$. Then we put as follows:

$$\langle\langle f,\eta\rangle\rangle_h := -\sqrt{-1}\big(\xi,\eta\big)_h,\quad \xi := \Big(\Lambda\circ e(f)-e\big(\Lambda(f)\big)\Big)(\eta)=\Lambda\big(f\cdot\eta\big)-\Lambda(f)\cdot\eta \tag{17}$$

We recall the following special case.

Proposition 2.3 (Kodaira [33], Cornalba-Griffiths [11]) *Let η be an element of $A_c^{0,1}(E)$. We have the following equality:*

$$||\overline{\partial}_E(\eta)||_h^2+||\overline{\partial}_E^*(\eta)||_h^2=||\nabla''\eta||^2+\int\big\langle\big\langle R(h)+Ric(g),\eta\big\rangle\big\rangle_h \mathrm{dvol}.$$

Proof See Proposition 4.5 in [38]. ▮

Corollary 2.5 *Let η be an element of $Dom(\overline{\partial}_E)\cap Dom(\overline{\partial}_E^*)$ in $A_h^{0,1}(E)$. Then we have the following inequality:*

$$||\overline{\partial}_E(\eta)||_h^2+||\overline{\partial}_E^*(\eta)||_h^2\geq\int\langle\langle R(h)+\mathrm{Ric}(g),\eta\rangle\rangle_h\,\mathrm{dvol}.$$

▮

2.7.4 Acceptable bundle

We put $X=\Delta^n$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^l D_i$. We have the Poincaré metric $g_{\mathbf{p}}$ on $X-D$:

$$g_{\mathbf{p}}:=\sum_{j=1}^{l}q_j^*g_0+\sum_{j=l+1}^{n}q_j^*g_1.$$

Here we put as follows:

$$g_1=\frac{2\cdot dz\cdot d\bar{z}}{(1-|z|^2)^2},\qquad g_0=\frac{2\cdot dz\cdot d\bar{z}}{|z|^2(-\log|z|^2)^2}.$$

We have the corresponding Kahler form:

$$\omega_{\mathbf{p}}:=\sum_{j=1}^{l}q_j^*\omega_0+\sum_{j=l+1}^{n}q_j^*\omega_1.$$

Here we put as follows:

$$\omega_1:=\frac{\sqrt{-1}dz\wedge d\bar{z}}{(1-|z|^2)^2},\qquad \omega_0:=\frac{\sqrt{-1}dz\wedge d\bar{z}}{|z|^2(-\log|z|^2)^2}.$$

Let P be a point of X and $(\mathcal{U},\varphi)$ be an admissible coordinate around P. By the isomorphism $\varphi:\mathcal{U}-D\simeq\Delta^{*\,l}\times\Delta^{n-l}$, we take the Poincaré metric $g_{\mathbf{p}}$ on $\mathcal{U}-D$. The metric h of E and the metric $g_{\mathbf{p}}$ on $T(\mathcal{U}-D)$ induce the metric $(\cdot,\cdot)_{h,g_{\mathbf{p}}}$ of $End(E)\otimes\Omega^{p,q}$ over $\mathcal{U}-D$. Recall the following definition.

Definition 2.7 *We say that $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h)$ is acceptable at P, if the following holds:*

- *Let $(\mathcal{U},\varphi)$ be an admissible coordinate around P. The norms of the curvature $R(h)$ with respect to the metric $(\cdot,\cdot)_{h,g_{\mathbf{p}}}$ is bounded over $\mathcal{U}-D$.*

When $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h)$ is acceptable at any point P, then we say that it is acceptable. ▮

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ be an acceptable bundle over $X - D$. We apply (16) for $\chi = \tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N)$, where the function $\tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N)$ is as follows:

$$\tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N) := \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i \log |z_i|^2 + N \cdot \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{l} \log(-\log |z_i|^2) + \sum_{i=l+1}^{n} \log(1 - |z_i|^2) \Big). \tag{18}$$

We use the notation $|\cdot|_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$, $||\cdot||_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$, $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$ and $\langle\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$ instead of $|\cdot|_{h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}}$, $||\cdot||_{h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}}$, $(\cdot,\cdot)_{h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}}$ and $\langle\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle\rangle_{h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}}$ for simplicity. We also use the notation $A^{p,q}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(E)$ instead of $A^{p,q}_{h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}}(E)$.

Lemma 2.28 *We have the following equality for any section* $\eta \in A^{0,q}_c(E)$*:*

$$\sqrt{-1}\Big(\big(\Lambda \overline{\partial}\partial \tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N)\eta\big) - \Lambda\big(\overline{\partial}\partial\tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N) \cdot \eta\big)\Big) = -N \cdot q \cdot \eta.$$

Proof We have $\overline{\partial}\partial\tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N) = -N \cdot \sqrt{-1} \cdot \omega_{\mathbf{p}}$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\text{L.H.S.} = \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big(-N\sqrt{-1}\big) \cdot \Big(\Lambda(\omega_{\mathbf{p}}\eta) - (\Lambda\omega_{\mathbf{p}}) \cdot \eta \Big) = N \cdot \big(-(n-q) \cdot \eta - n \cdot \eta \big) = -q \cdot N \cdot \eta = \text{R.H.S.}.$$

Hence we are done. ▮

2.7.5 The vanishing of the cohomology of acceptable bundle (When N is sufficiently negative)

We have the following inequality:

$$\big\langle \overline{\partial}_E\eta,\ \overline{\partial}_E\eta \big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} + \big\langle \partial_E\eta,\ \partial_E\eta \big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} \geq \sqrt{-1} \cdot \big\langle \Lambda(\Omega^{0,q}) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} - \sqrt{-1} \cdot \Big\langle \Lambda\big(R(h) \cdot \eta\big) - \Lambda R(h) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \Big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} - N \cdot q \cdot ||\eta||^2_{\boldsymbol{a},N}. \tag{19}$$

Lemma 2.29 *When* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ *is an acceptable bundle, there exists a positive constant* $C > 0$ *satisfying the following for any* $q = 1, \ldots, n$ *and for any* $\eta \in A^{0,q}_c(E)$*:*

$$\Big| \Big\langle \Lambda(\Omega^{0,q}) \cdot \eta - \Lambda\big(R(h) \cdot \eta\big) + \Lambda(R(h)) \cdot \eta,\ \eta \Big\rangle_h \Big| \leq C \cdot |\eta|^2_h$$

Proof Recall that $R(h)$ is dominated by $\omega_{\mathbf{p}}$. Then the claim follows from a direct calculation of the curvature of Poincaré metric $g_{\mathbf{p}}$. ▮

If we take a sufficiently negative integer N such that $N < -C - 1$ for the constant C as in Lemma 2.29, then we obtain the following inequalities for any $q \geq 1$ and for any $\eta \in A^{0,q}_c(E)$, due to the inequality (19):

$$\big\langle \overline{\partial}_E\eta,\ \overline{\partial}_E\eta \big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} + \big\langle \partial_E\eta,\ \partial_E\eta \big\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} \geq ||\eta||^2_{\boldsymbol{a},N}. \tag{20}$$

Lemma 2.30 *Let* C *be a positive constant as in Lemma* 2.29*. If* $N < -C - 1$*, we have the vanishings of any higher cohomology group* $H^i\big(A^{0,\cdot}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda}\big)$ $(i > 0)$*.*

Proof It follows from Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 and (20). ▮

2.7.6 A lemma for an increasing order (When N is sufficiently positive)

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ be an acceptable hermitian holomorphic bundle over $X - D$. The following lemma will be used in many times. It says, we obtain the increasing order of a holomorphic section over $\Delta^{*\,l} \times \Delta^{n-l}$ from the increasing order of the restriction to the curves, which are transversal with the smooth part of the singularity D.

Let π_j denote the projection of X onto D_j. Let $Y(C)$ denote the set $\big\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \,\big|\, 0 < |z_i| < C,\ (i = 1, \ldots, l),\ |z_i| < C\ (i = l+1, \ldots, n)\big\}$.

Corollary 2.6 *Let F be a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. Let a_j and k_j be real numbers $(j = 1, \ldots, l)$.*

For any point $p \in \Delta^*(C)^{l-1} \times \Delta(C)^{n-l}$ and any $1 \leq j \leq l$, we assume that we are given numbers $C_1(p,j)$, $C_2(p,j)$, $a(p,j)$ and $k(p,j)$ satisfying the following:

1. *$C_1(p,j)$ and $C_2(p,j)$ are positive numbers.*
2. *$a(p,j)$ and $k(p,j)$ are real numbers satisfying $a(p,j) \leq a_j$ and $k(p,j) \leq k_j$.*
3. *The following inequality holds on $\pi_j^{-1}(p)$:*

$$0 < C_1(p,j) \leq \big|F_{|\pi_j^{-1}(p)}\big|_h \cdot |z_j|^{-a(p,j)} \cdot \big(-\log|z_j|\big)^{-k(p,j)} \leq C_2(p,j).$$

4. *$C_1(p,j)$, $C_2(p,j)$, $a(p,j)$ and $k(p,j)$ may depend on p and j.*

Then there exists a positive constant C_3 and a large number M, satisfying the following:

- *The inequality $|s|_h \leq C_3 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{a_j}(-\log|z_j|)^M$ holds over $Y(C)$.*
- *The constant C_3 depends only on the values of $|s|_h$ on the following compact set:*

$$\big\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n)\,\big|\, |z_j| = C,\ (j = 1, \ldots, l),\ |z_j| \leq C\ (j = l+1, \ldots, n)\big\}.$$

Proof See Corollary 4.12 of [38]. ■

2.7.7 The metrics and the curvatures of $\mathcal{O}(i)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$

In the next few subsubsecions, we recall the subsubsection 4.7.3 in [38]. Let $\mathbb{P}^1$ denote the one dimensional projective space over $\boldsymbol{C}$. We use the homogeneous coordinate $[t_0 : t_1]$. The points $[0 : 1]$ and $[1 : 0]$ are denoted by 0 and ∞ respectively. We use the coordinates $t = t_0/t_1$ and $s = t_1/t_0$. We have the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(i)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The coordinates of $\mathcal{O}(i)$ is given as follows: (t, ζ_1) over $\mathbb{P}^1 - \{\infty\}$, and (s, ζ_2) over $\mathbb{P}^1 - \{0\}$. The relations are given by $s = t^{-1}$ and $t^{-i} \cdot \zeta_1 = \zeta_2$.

Recall that we have the smooth metric h_i of $\mathcal{O}(i)$. Let $\xi = (t, \zeta_1) = (s, \zeta_2)$ be an element of $\mathcal{O}(i)$.

$$h_i(\xi, \xi) := |\zeta_1|^2 \cdot \big(1 + |t|^2\big)^{-i} = |\zeta_2|^2 \cdot \big(1 + |s|^2\big)^{-i}.$$

For any real numbers a and b, we have the possibly singular metrics $h_{i,(a,b)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(i)$: Let $\xi = (t, \zeta_1) = (s, \zeta_2)$ be an element of $\mathcal{O}(i)$.

$$h_{i,(a,b)}(\xi,\xi) := h_i(\xi,\xi) \cdot \big(1 + |t|^{-2}\big)^{a} \cdot \big(1 + |t|^2\big)^{b} = h_i(\xi,\xi) \cdot \big(1 + |s|^2\big)^{a} \cdot \big(1 + |s|^{-2}\big)^{b}.$$

Around $|t| = 0$, the order of $h_{i,(a,b)}$ is equivalent to $|t|^{-2a}$. Around $|s| = 0$, the order of $h_{i,(a,b)}$ is equivalent to $|s|^{-2b}$. The curvature $R(h_{i,a,b})$ is as follows:

$$R(h_{i,a,b}) = (-a - b + i) \cdot \frac{dt \cdot d\bar{t}}{\big(1 + |t|\big)^2}. \tag{21}$$

Let take a point $P \in \mathbb{P}^1$. Then we obtain a morphism $\mathcal{O}(i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(i+1)$ of coherent sheaves.

Lemma 2.31 *The morphism is bounded with respect to the metrics $h_{i,(a,b)}$ and $h_{i+1,(a,b)}$.* ■

2.7.8 Some open subset of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ with the complete Kahler metric

We are mainly interested in the case $i=-1$. We regard $\mathcal{O}(-1)$ as a complex manifold. The open submanifold Y is defined to be $\bigl\{\xi\in\mathcal{O}(-1)\,\big|\,h_{-1,(0,0)}(\xi,\xi)<1\bigr\}$. We denote the naturally defined projection of Y onto $\mathbb{P}^1$ by π. We denote the image of the 0-section $\mathbb{P}^1\longrightarrow Y$ by $\mathbb{P}^1$. Then we have the normal crossing divisor $D'=\mathbb{P}^1\cup\pi^{-1}(0)\cup\pi^{-1}(\infty)$ of Y. The manifold $Y-D'$ is same as $\bigl\{(t,x)\in\boldsymbol{C}^{*\,2}\,\big|\,|x|^2\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)<1\bigr\}$.

We have the complete Kahler metric $g:=g_1+g_2+g_3$ of $Y-D'$ given as follows: As a contribution of the 0-section $\mathbb{P}^1$, we put $\tau_1=-\log\Bigl[\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)\cdot|x|^2\Bigr]$, and as follows:

$$g_1:=\frac{1}{\tau_1^2}\left(\frac{\bar{t}\cdot dt}{1+|t|^2}+\frac{dx}{x}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{t\cdot d\bar{t}}{1+|t|^2}+\frac{d\bar{x}}{\bar{x}}\right)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}\frac{dt\cdot d\bar{t}}{\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)^2}.$$

Lemma 2.32 *Note that g_1 gives the complete Kahler metric of $Y-\mathbb{P}^1$. It is equivalent to the Poincarè metric around the divisor $\mathbb{P}^1$.* ∎

As a contribution of $\pi^{-1}(\infty)$, we put $\tau_2=\log\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)$, and as follows:

$$g_2=\frac{1}{\tau_2}\Bigl(-1+\frac{|t|^2}{\tau_2}\Bigr)\cdot\frac{dt\cdot d\bar{t}}{\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)^2}.$$

Lemma 2.33 *We have $-1+|t|^2\cdot\tau_2^{-1}>0$. Around $|t|=\infty$, or equivalently, around $|s|=0$, the g_2 is similar to $(-|s|\log|s|)^{-2}ds\cdot d\bar{s}$. Around $|t|=0$, we have $g_2=\bigl(2^{-1}+o(|t|^2)\bigr)\cdot dt\cdot d\bar{t}$.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

As the contribution of the divisor $\pi^{-1}(0)$, we put $\tau_3:=\log(1+|t|^2)-\log|t|^2=\log(1+|s|^2)$, where we use $s=t^{-1}$. And we put as follows:

$$g_3=\frac{1}{\tau_3}\cdot\Bigl(-1+\frac{|s|^2}{\tau_3}\Bigr)\frac{ds\cdot d\bar{s}}{\bigl(1+|s|^2\bigr)^2}.$$

By the symmetry, the behaviour of g_3 is similar to g_2. (See Lemma 2.33)

The following lemma can be checked directly.

Lemma 2.34 *The metric g gives the complete Kahler metric of the complex manifold $Y-D'$. Around the divisors $\mathbb{P}^1$, $\pi^{-1}(0)$ and $\pi^{-1}(\infty)$, the behaviours of the metric g are equivalent to the Poincaré metric.* ∎

We note the following formulas:

$$\overline{\partial}\partial\log\tau_1=\frac{1}{\tau_1^2}\Bigl(\frac{\bar{t}\cdot dt}{1+|t|^2}+\frac{dx}{x}\Bigr)\wedge\Bigl(\frac{t\cdot d\bar{t}}{1+|t|^2}+\frac{d\bar{x}}{\bar{x}}\Bigr)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}\frac{dt\wedge d\bar{t}}{\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)^2}=:\omega_1,$$

$$\overline{\partial}\partial\log\tau_2=\frac{1}{\tau_2}\Bigl(-1+\frac{|t|^2}{\tau_2}\Bigr)\cdot\frac{dt\wedge d\bar{t}}{\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)^2}=:\omega_2,\quad\overline{\partial}\partial\log\tau_3=\frac{1}{\tau_3}\Bigl(-1+\frac{|s|^2}{\tau_3}\Bigr)\cdot\frac{ds\wedge d\bar{s}}{\bigl(1+|s|^2\bigr)^2}=:\omega_3.$$

We put $\omega=\omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3$. We put as follows:

$$H_0=\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}\Bigl(-1+\frac{|t|^2}{\tau_2}\Bigr)+\frac{1}{\tau_3}\Bigl(-1+\frac{|s|^2}{\tau_3}\Bigr)>0.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\omega^2=\det(g)\cdot dt\wedge d\bar{t}\wedge dx\wedge d\bar{x}=\Bigl(\frac{1}{\tau_1^2\cdot|x|^2\cdot\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)^2}\times H_0\Bigr)\cdot dt\wedge d\bar{t}\wedge dx\wedge d\bar{x}.$$

We put as follows:

$$H_1:=\frac{H_0}{\bigl(1+|t|^2\bigr)\cdot\bigl(1+|s|^2\bigr)}$$

Recall that we have $\mathrm{Ric}(g)=\overline{\partial}\partial(\det(g))$.

Lemma 2.35

- *Let C be a number such that $0 < C < 1$. On the domain $\big\{(t,x) \in \boldsymbol{C}^{*\,2} \,\big|\, |x|^2 \cdot \big(1+|t|^2\big) \leq C\big\}$, we have the following similarity of the behaviour:*

$$H_1 \sim (\log|t|)^{-2}, \qquad (|t| \to \infty, \text{or}, \ |t| \to 0),$$
$$H_1 \sim (-\log|x|)^{-1}, \quad (|x| \to 0).$$

- *We have the equality: $Ric(g) - \overline{\partial}\partial \log(H_1) = -\overline{\partial}\partial \log \tau_1^2$.* ▮

2.7.9 The inequality and the vanishing for the acceptable bundle

We put $\Delta_z^2 = \{(z_1,z_2) \,|\, |z_i| < 1\}$ and $D'_i = \{z_i = 0\} \subset \Delta_z^2$. Let $\varphi : \widetilde{\Delta_z^2} \longrightarrow \Delta_z^2$ denote the blow up of Δ_z^2 at the origin $O = (0,0)$. We have the exceptional divisor $\varphi^{-1}(O)$, the proper transforms $\widetilde{D'}_i$ of D'_i.

We put $\widetilde{X} = \widetilde{\Delta_z^2} \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$. Then we have the composite ψ of the natural morphisms:

$$\widetilde{X} \xrightarrow{\varphi \times id} \Delta_z^2 \times \Delta_w^{n-2} \longrightarrow \Delta_z^n.$$

Here the latter morphism is the natural isomorphism given by $w_i = z_{i+2}$. We put $\widetilde{D} := \psi^{-1}(D)$, which is same as the following:

$$\big(\varphi^{-1}(0,0) \cup \widetilde{D'_1} \cup \widetilde{D'_2}\big) \times \Delta_w^{n-2} \cup \Delta_z^2 \times \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-2} \{w_i = 0\}\Big).$$

The restriction of ψ to $\widetilde{X} - \widetilde{D}$ gives an isomorphism $\widetilde{X} - \widetilde{D} \simeq X - D$.

We can take a holomorphic embedding ι of Y, given in the subsubsection 2.7.8, to $\widetilde{\Delta}^2$ satisfying the following:

- The image of the 0-section $\mathbb{P}^1$ is the exceptional divisor $\phi^{-1}(O)$.
- We have $\iota^{-1}(D'_1) = \pi^{-1}(\infty)$ and $\iota^{-1}(D'_2) = \pi^{-1}(0)$.

We put $\overline{X} := Y \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$. Then we have the naturally induced morphism $\overline{X} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\Delta_z^2} \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$, which we also denote by ι. We put as follows:

$$\overline{D} := \iota^{-1}(\widetilde{D}), \quad \overline{X^{(1)}} := \pi^{-1}(P) \times \Delta_w^{n-2}, \quad \overline{D^{(1)}} := \overline{X^{(1)}} \cap \overline{D}.$$

Note that $\iota(\overline{X})$ gives a neighborhood of $\widetilde{X_0}$ in $\widetilde{X}$. The composite $\psi \circ \iota$ is denoted by ψ_1.

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E)$ be a holomorphic bundle with a hermitian metric h over $X - D$. We assume that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ is acceptable in the sense of Definition 2.7. We denote the curvature of $\psi_1^*(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h)$ by $\psi_1^* R(h)$. It is dominated by $\psi_1^* \overline{\partial}\partial \log \tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N)$ for sufficiently negative number N. (See (18) for the definition of $\tau(\boldsymbol{a}, N)$).

Let ϵ_i $(i = 1,2)$ be positive numbers such that $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 < 1$.

Lemma 2.36 *We can pick positive numbers ϵ and negative numbers a and b satisfying the following:*

$$-a - b = 1, \quad 0 < -a < 1 - \epsilon_1 - \epsilon, \quad 0 < -b < 1 - \epsilon_2 - \epsilon.$$

Proof It can be checked elementarily. ▮

Let ϵ, a and b be as in Lemma 2.36. The metric $\tilde{h}$ of $\psi_1^*(E)(-\overline{X}^{(1)}) := \psi_1^*(E) \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(-1)$ over the complex manifold $Y - D'$ is given as follows:

$$\tilde{h}_{N,\epsilon,a,b} := \psi_1^* h_{\boldsymbol{a},N} \cdot h_{-1,a,b} \cdot H_1^{-1} \cdot \tau_1^{2+\epsilon} \big(\tau_2 \cdot \tau_3\big)^{\epsilon}. \tag{22}$$

For simplicity, we use the notation $\tilde{h}$ instead of $\tilde{h}_{N,\epsilon,a,b}$.

Lemma 2.37 *Let ϵ, a and b be as in Lemma* 2.36. *When N is sufficiently smaller than* 0*, then the following inequality holds for any $\eta \in A^{0,1}_c(\psi_1^* E(-\overline{X}^{(1)}))$:*

$$\langle\langle R(\tilde{h}) + \mathrm{Ric}(g), \eta\rangle\rangle_{\tilde{h}} \geq \epsilon ||\eta||^2_{\tilde{h}}.$$

(See the formula (17) *for the definition of $\langle\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle\rangle_{\tilde{h}}$.)*

Proof We have the following equality:

$$R(\tilde{h}) + \mathrm{Ric}(g) = R(\psi_1^* h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}) + R(h_{-1,a,b}) - \overline{\partial}\partial \log H_1 + (2+\epsilon)\cdot \overline{\partial}\partial\log\tau_1 + \epsilon\cdot\overline{\partial}\partial(\log\tau_2 + \log\tau_3) + \mathrm{Ric}(g)$$
$$= R(\psi_1^* h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}) + \epsilon(\omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3). \quad (23)$$

Here we have used $R(h_{-1,a,b}) = 0$ due to (21) and our choice of a and b. By taking sufficiently negative N, we can assume the following inequality for any $\eta \in A^{0,1}_c(E)$ on $X - D$:

$$\langle\langle R(h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}), \eta\rangle\rangle_{\boldsymbol{a},N} \geq 0.$$

Then, by a fiberwise linear algebraic argument, it is easy to see that the following inequality holds for any $\eta \in A^{0,1}_c(\psi_1^*(E))$:

$$\langle\langle \psi^* R(h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}), \eta\rangle\rangle_{\tilde{h}} \geq 0.$$

On the other hand, we obtain $\big\langle\big\langle \omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3, \eta\big\rangle\big\rangle_{\tilde{h}} \geq \epsilon\cdot ||\eta||_{\tilde{h}}$, which can be checked directly from definition. Thus we are done. ▮

Corollary 2.7 *Let ϵ, a and b be as in Lemma* 2.36. *If N is sufficiently negative, then the first cohomology $H^1\big(A^{0,\cdot}_{\tilde{h}}\big(\psi_1^{-1}E(-\overline{X}^{(1)})\big)\big)$ vanishes.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 2.37, Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2. ▮

We remark the following.

Lemma 2.38 *The contribution of $h_{-1,a,b}\cdot H_1^{-1}\cdot\tau_1^{2+\epsilon}\cdot\big(\tau_2\cdot\tau_3\big)^{\epsilon}$ to the metric $\tilde{h}$ is equivalent to the following, around $|t| = 0$:*

$$|t|^{-2a}\cdot\big(-\log|t|\big)^2\cdot|t|^{2\epsilon}\big(-\log|t|\big)^{2\epsilon} = |t|^{-2(a-\epsilon)}\cdot\big(-\log|t|\big)^{2+2\epsilon}.$$

We have a similar estimate around $|s| = 0$. The contribution is equivalent to $(-\log|x|)^{3+\epsilon}$ around $x = 0$.

Proof We have the following equivalences:

$$h_{-1,a,b}\sim|t|^{-2a},\quad H_1^{-1}\sim(-\log|t|)^2,\quad \tau_1^{2+\epsilon}\sim\big(-\log|x|^2\big)^{2+\epsilon}\quad \tau_2^{\epsilon}\sim|t|^{2\epsilon}\quad \tau_3^{\epsilon}\sim(-\log|t|)^{2\epsilon}.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

2.8 Preliminary from functional analysis

2.8.1 On a family of complexes of Hilbert spaces

Lemma 2.39 *Let H_i $(i = 1,2)$ be Hilbert spaces. Let $F(\lambda) : H_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ be bounded morphisms depending on $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon)$. Assume the following:*

1. *$F(\lambda)$ is bounded for any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon)$.*
2. *There exists a positive constant C such that $||F(\lambda) - F(\lambda')|| \leq C\cdot|\lambda-\lambda'|$ for any $\lambda,\lambda'\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon)$.*
3. *F is holomorphic with respect to λ in the following sense: For any $v\in H_1$, $F(\lambda)(v)$ gives a holomorphic function from $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon)\longrightarrow H_2$. (See* [34] *for Hilbert space valued holomorphic functions, for example.)*
4. *$F(\lambda_0)$ is surjective.*

Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that the following holds:

- *$F(\lambda)$ is surjective for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*
- *There exists a family of bounded morphisms $\Psi(\lambda) : H_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ for $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$, and the following holds:*
    1. *$\Psi(\lambda)$ is homeomorphic for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*
    2. *There exists a positive constant C' such that the following holds:*

$$\max\Big\{ \big|\big|\Psi(\lambda) - \Psi(\lambda')\big|\big|, \quad \big|\big|\Psi(\lambda)^{-1} - \Psi(\lambda')^{-1}\big|\big| \Big\} \leq |\lambda - \lambda'| \cdot C'.$$

    3. *$\Psi(\lambda)$ is holomorphic with respect to λ.*
    4. *The following diagramm is commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} H_1 \arrow[r, "F(\lambda_0)"] \arrow[d, "\Psi"'] & H_2 \arrow[d, "id"'] \\ H_1 \arrow[r, "F(\lambda)"] & H_2. \end{tikzcd}$$

Proof We put $C_1 := \operatorname{Ker} F(\lambda_0)$ and $C_2 = \operatorname{Ker} F(\lambda_0)^{\perp}$. We put $\varphi := F(\lambda_0)_{|C_2} : C_2 \longrightarrow H_2$ is bijective and bounded. Hence it is homeomorphic, i.e., φ^{-1} is also bounded.

We have the bounded morphisms $a(\lambda) : C_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ and $b(\lambda) : C_2 \longrightarrow H_2$ defined by $a(\lambda) = F(\lambda)_{|C_1}$ and $b(\lambda) = F(\lambda)_{|C_2} - \varphi$. It is easy to check the following:

- a and b are holomorphic with respect to λ.
- There exists positive constants C_2 such that $|a(\lambda) - a(\lambda')| \leq C_2 \cdot |\lambda - \lambda'|$ and $|b(\lambda) - b(\lambda')| \leq C_2 \cdot |\lambda - \lambda'|$.
- $a(\lambda_0) = b(\lambda_0) = 0$.

Since φ is homeomorphic, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\varphi + b(\lambda)$ is homeomorphic for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$. In particular, $F(\lambda)$ is surjective.

The morphism $\Psi : C_1 \oplus C_2 \longrightarrow C_1 \oplus C_2$ can be given as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & (\varphi + b(\lambda))^{-1} \circ a(\lambda) \\ 0 & (\varphi + b(\lambda))^{-1} \circ \varphi(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then it is easy to check that Ψ has the desired properties. ▮

Corollary 2.8 *Let F and H_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be as in Lemma* 2.39*. There exists a positive constant $\eta > 0$ and the linear morphism $G(\lambda) : \operatorname{Ker} F(\lambda_0) \longrightarrow H_1$ depending on $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ with the following properties:*

- *It satisfies the conditions* 1*,* 2 *and* 3 *in Lemma* 2.39*.*
- *For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$, $G(\lambda)$ gives a homeomorphism $\operatorname{Ker} F(\lambda_0) \simeq \operatorname{Ker} F(\lambda)$.*

Namely it gives the trivialization of the family of Hilbert spaces $\big\{\operatorname{Ker}(F(\lambda)) \,\big|\, \lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)\big\}$.

Proof We have only to restrict Ψ to $\operatorname{Ker}(F(\lambda_0))$. ▮

Reduction procedure We have the standard reduction procedure of the family of the complexes of Hilbert spaces, as is explained in the following. Let us consider the following family of complexes of Hilbert spaces H_i $(i = 0, 1, 2)$ depending on $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon)$:

$$H_0 \xrightarrow{F_0(\lambda)} H_1 \xrightarrow{F_1(\lambda)} H_2. \tag{24}$$

Assume the family satisfies the following conditions:

- F_0 and F_1 satisfy the conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Lemma 2.39.
- F_1 satisfies the condition 4 in Lemma 2.39.
- The complex at λ_0 is exact, i.e., $\operatorname{Ker}(F_1(\lambda_0)) = \operatorname{Im} F_0(\lambda_0)$.

Then we can take the family of the morphisms $\Psi(\lambda) : H_1 \longrightarrow H_1$ depending on $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ as in Lemma 2.39. We put $F_0'(\lambda) := \Psi^{-1} \circ F_0(\lambda)$.

Lemma 2.40 *The image of $F_0'(\lambda)$ is contained in $\operatorname{Ker} F_1(\lambda_0)$.*

Proof We have $F_1(\lambda_0) \circ F_0'(\lambda) = F_1(\lambda) \circ \Psi \circ \Psi^{-1} \circ F_0(\lambda) = F_1(\lambda) \circ F_0(\lambda) = 0$. ▮

Hence we obtain the family of morphisms $F_0''(\lambda) : H_0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker}(F(\lambda_0))$ depending on $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$. By our construction, F_0'' satisfies the conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Lemma 2.39. Since the complex is exact at λ_0, the morphism F_0'' satisfies the condition 4 in Lemma 2.39, too.

Lemma 2.41 *Let H_i $(i = 0, \ldots, n)$ be Hilbert spaces. For simplicity, we put $H_{n+1} = 0$. Let $d_i(\lambda) : H_i \longrightarrow H_{i+1}$ be family of linear morphisms satisfying the conditions* 1, 2 *and* 3 *in Lemma* 2.39*. Assume the following:*

- *The higher cohomology groups vanishes at λ_0. Namely, we have $\operatorname{Ker}(d_{i+1}(\lambda_0)) = \operatorname{Im}(d_i(\lambda_0))$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$.*

Then there exists a positive constant η and the family of linear morphisms $G(\lambda) : \operatorname{Ker} d_0(\lambda_0) \longrightarrow H^0$ $(\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta))$ satisfying the following:

- *The higher cohomology groups vanishes at any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*
- *$G(\lambda)$ satisfies the conditions* 1, 2 *and* 3 *in Lemma* 2.39*, and it gives the trivialization of the family $\{\operatorname{Ker} d_0(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)\}$, namely, $G(\lambda)$ gives the homeomorphism of $\operatorname{Ker} d_0(\lambda_0)$ and $\operatorname{Ker} d_0(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*

Proof We have only to use the above reduction procedure successively and Corollary 2.8. ▮

2.8.2 Sobolev spaces

We recall the following theorem (See Theorem 9.1 in [40]).

Proposition 2.4 *Let p and q be real numbers such that $p, q \geq 1$. Let k and l be real numbers satisfying the following inequality: $k - \frac{m}{p} \geq l - \frac{m}{q}$. Then we have the natural inclusion $L_k^p(\boldsymbol{R}^m) \subset L_l^q(\boldsymbol{R}^m)$, and it is continuous. If the inequality $k > l$ and $k - \frac{m}{p} > l - \frac{m}{q}$ hold, then the inclusion is compact.*

Lemma 2.42 *Let p be a real number such that $p > 2d$. We put as follows for $i = 1, \ldots, d$:*

$$q_i := \begin{cases} \dfrac{2d}{d-i} & (i < d) \\ p & (i = d) \end{cases}$$

Then we have the continuous inclusion $L_2^{q_{i-1}}(\boldsymbol{R}^{2d}) \subset L_1^{q_i}(\boldsymbol{R}^{2d})$.

Proof We have the following relation from our choice of q_i:

$$2 - \frac{2n}{q_{i-1}} \geq 1 - \frac{2n}{q_i}.$$

Then the lemma immediately follows from 2.4. ▮

2.9 An estimate of the norms of Higgs field and the conjugate

2.9.1 Preliminary

Let X_0 be an open subset of $\boldsymbol{C}_z^m$. Assume that we are given the holomorphic one forms $\eta_i \in \Omega_{X_0}^{1,0}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$, which gives are frame. For example, we consider $dz_1, \ldots, dz_m$ or $z_1^{-1} \cdot dz_1, \ldots, z_m^{-1} \cdot dz_m$. We put $X = \Delta_\zeta^d \times X_0$.

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a harmonic bundle over X of rank r. Then we have the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ with the holomorphic structure $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda}$ and the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^\lambda$. (See the subsection 3.1 in our previous paper [38]).

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a C^∞-frame of $E = \mathcal{E}^\lambda$. The $(0,1)$-form $K \in C^\infty(X, \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes M(r))$ is determined by the following relation:

$$\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot K.$$

The $(1,0)$-form $A \in C^\infty(X, \Omega^{1,0} \otimes M(r))$ is determined by the following relation:

$$\mathbb{D}^\lambda \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot (A + K).$$

We also have $\Theta \in C^\infty(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega_X^{1,0})$ and $\Theta^\dagger \in C^\infty(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega_X^{0,1})$ given by the following relation:

$$\theta \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \Theta, \qquad \theta^\dagger \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \Theta^\dagger.$$

We decompose as follows:

$$\Theta = \sum \Theta_{\zeta_i} \cdot d\zeta_i + \sum \Theta_{\eta_j} \cdot \eta_j, \qquad \Theta^\dagger = \sum \Theta_{\zeta_i}^\dagger \cdot d\overline{\zeta}_i + \sum \Theta_{\eta_j}^\dagger \cdot \overline{\eta}_j.$$

Lemma 2.43 *We have the following relation:*

$$\overline{\partial}\Theta + \bigl[K - \lambda\Theta^\dagger, \Theta\bigr] = 0.$$

Proof It follows from the relations $\overline{\partial}_E = \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} - \lambda \cdot \theta^\dagger$ and $\overline{\partial}_E \theta = 0$. ▮

Lemma 2.44 *We have the following relation:*

$$\partial\Theta^\dagger + \lambda^{-1}\bigl[A - \Theta, \Theta^\dagger\bigr] = 0.$$

Proof It follows from the relation $\partial_E = \lambda^{-1} \cdot \bigl(\mathbb{D}^\lambda - \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} - \theta\bigr)$ and $\partial_E \theta^\dagger = 0$. ▮

Let φ be a C^∞-function.

Lemma 2.45 *We have the following formula:*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\partial}\bigl(\varphi^{2b} \cdot \Theta\bigr) &= -\bigl[\varphi^b K - \lambda \cdot \varphi^b \Theta^\dagger,\ \varphi^b \Theta\bigr] - 2 \cdot \overline{\partial}\varphi^b \cdot \varphi^b \Theta, \\ \partial(\varphi^{2b}\Theta^\dagger) &= -\lambda^{-1} \cdot \bigl[\varphi^b A - \varphi^b \Theta,\ \varphi^b \Theta^\dagger\bigr] - 2 \cdot \partial\varphi^b \cdot \varphi^b \Theta^\dagger \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 2.43 and Lemma 2.44. ▮

Lemma 2.46 *We have the following relation for* $\zeta = \zeta_j$ *and* $a = \zeta_j, z_k$*:*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\partial}_\zeta\bigl(\varphi^{2b}\Theta_a\bigr) &= -\bigl[\varphi^b K_\zeta - \lambda \cdot \varphi^b \Theta_\zeta^\dagger,\ \varphi^b \Theta_a\bigr] - 2 \cdot \overline{\partial}_\zeta \varphi^b \cdot \varphi^b \Theta_a, \\ \partial_\zeta\bigl(\varphi^{2b}\Theta_a^\dagger\bigr) &= -\lambda^{-1} \cdot \bigl[\varphi^b A_\zeta - \varphi^b \Theta_\zeta,\ \varphi^b \Theta_a^\dagger\bigr] - 2 \cdot \overline{\partial}_\zeta \varphi^b \cdot \varphi^b \Theta_a^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Proof It immediately follows from (25) ▮

Lemma 2.47 *We have the following formulas:*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\zeta\overline{\partial}_\zeta\big(\varphi^{2b}\Theta\big) = \quad & -\big[\partial_\zeta\big(\varphi^b K_\zeta\big)-\lambda\cdot\partial_\zeta\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger_\zeta,\ \varphi^b\Theta_a\big]-\big[\varphi^b K_\zeta-\lambda\cdot\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger_\zeta,\ \partial_\zeta\varphi^b\Theta_a\big]-2\cdot\partial_\zeta\overline{\partial}_\zeta\varphi^b\cdot\varphi^b\Theta_a\\ & -2\cdot\overline{\partial}_\zeta\varphi^b\cdot\partial_\zeta\big(\varphi^b\Theta_a\big),\\ \overline{\partial}_\zeta\partial_\zeta\big(\varphi^{2b}\Theta^\dagger\big) = \quad & -\lambda^{-1}\cdot\big[\overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b A_\zeta)-\overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta_\zeta),\ \varphi^b\Theta^\dagger\big]-\lambda^{-1}\cdot\big[\varphi^b A_\zeta-\varphi^b\Theta_\zeta,\ \overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger)\big]\\ & -2\cdot\overline{\partial}_\zeta\partial_\zeta\varphi^b\cdot\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger-2\cdot\partial_\zeta\varphi^b\cdot\overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger).\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

Proof It immediately follows from (26). ▮

Lemma 2.48 *Let f be a compact support C^∞-function on X. Then we have the following equality:*

$$\int(\overline{\partial}f,\overline{\partial}f)=\int(\partial f,\partial f).$$

Proof It follows from the following:

$$\int(\overline{\partial}f,\overline{\partial}f)=-\int(f,\Delta(f))=\int(\partial f,\partial f).$$

Here we have used the Kahler identity $\overline{\partial}^*\overline{\partial}=\Delta=\partial^*\partial$. ▮

2.9.2 An estimate

Let P be a point of X_0. A L^p_k-function spaces on $\Delta^d_\zeta\times\{P\}$ is denoted by $L^p_{k,P}$. If $k=0$, we use the notation L^p_P. For a C^∞-function F on X, we obtain the restriction $F_{|P}:=F_{|\Delta^d_\zeta\times\{P\}}$, and the norm $\big|\big|F_{|P}\big|\big|_{L^p_k}$. For simplicity, we denote it by $\big|\big|F\big|\big|_{L^p_{k\,P}}$. We put as follows:

$$Q(P):=||\Theta||_{L^\infty_P}+||\Theta^\dagger||_{L^\infty_P}+||K||_{L^\infty_P}+||A||_{L^\infty_P}+1.\tag{28}$$

Let us pick a C^∞-function φ on Δ^d_ζ satisfying the following:

$$0\leq\varphi(P_1)\leq 1,\qquad \varphi(\zeta)=\begin{cases}1 & \big(P_1\in\Delta^d_\zeta(1/3)\big)\\ 0 & \big(P_1\not\in\Delta^d_\zeta(2/3)\big)\end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.49 *For any $b\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have the following:*

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b\Theta||_{L^\infty_P},\ ||\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger||_{L^\infty_P}\Big\}\leq Q(P).$$

Proof It immediately follows from our choice of $Q(P)$. ▮

Lemma 2.50 *For any $b\in 2\cdot\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists a positive constant $C_1(b)$ such that the following holds:*

$$\max\Big\{||\overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta)||_{L^2_P},\ ||\partial_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger)||_{L^2_P}\Big\}\leq C_1(b)\cdot Q(P)^2.$$

Proof It follows from (26) and Lemma 2.49. ▮

Lemma 2.51 *For any $b\in 2\cdot\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists a positive constant $C_1(b)$ such that the following holds:*

$$\max\Big\{||\partial_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta)||_{L^2_P},\ ||\overline{\partial}_\zeta(\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger)||_{L^2_P}\Big\}\leq C_1(b)\cdot Q(P)^2.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 2.50 and Lemma 2.48. ▮

Lemma 2.52 *For any $b \in 2^2 \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists a positive constant $C_2(b) > 0$ such that the following holds:*

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b\Theta||_{L^2_{2,P}},\ ||\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger||_{L^2_{2,P}}\Big\} \le C_3(b) \cdot Q(P)^3.$$

Proof From (27), Lemma 2.51 and Lemma 2.49, we obtain the following for any $b \in 2^2 \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$

$$\max\Big\{||\partial_\zeta\overline{\partial}_\zeta\big(\varphi^b\Theta\big)_a||_{L^2},\ ||\partial_\zeta\overline{\partial}_\zeta\big(\varphi^b\Theta_a^\dagger\big)||_{L^2}\Big\} \le C'(b) \cdot Q(P)^3.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Lemma 2.53 *Let b be an integer contained in $2^{2+i} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let q_i $(i = 1, \ldots, d)$ be the numbers given in Lemma 2.42. Then there exist positive constants $C_{2+i}(b)$ satisfying the following:*

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^{q_i}_{2,P}},\ ||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^{q_i}_{2,P}}\Big\} \le C_{2+i}(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+i}. \tag{29}$$

Proof We use an induction on i. We have already known the claim for $i = 0$ holds. We assume the claim for i holds, and we will show that the claim for $i + 1$ holds.

Due to our hypothesis of our induction, we have the following inequality:

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^{q_i}_{2,P}},\ ||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^{q_i}_{2,P}}\Big\} \le C_{2+i}(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+i}.$$

Recall that we have the continuous inclusion $L_2^{q_i} \subset L_1^{q_{i+1}}$ due to Lemma 2.42. Thus we obtain the following:

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{1,P}},\ ||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{1,P}}\Big\} \le C'(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+i}.$$

In particular, we obtain the following:

$$\max\Big\{||\partial_\zeta\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{P}},\ ||\overline{\partial}_\zeta\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{P}}\Big\} \le C''(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+i}.$$

Then we obtain the following due to Lemma 2.49 and (27):

$$\max\Big\{||\overline{\partial}\partial_\zeta\varphi^{2b} \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{P}},\ ||\partial\overline{\partial}_\zeta\varphi^{2b} \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^{q_{i+1}}_{P}}\Big\} \le C^{(3)}(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+i+1}.$$

Thus we obtain the inequality (29) for $i + 1$, and the induction can proceed. ▮

Corollary 2.9 *Let p be a real number such that $p > 2d = 2\dim_{\boldsymbol{C}} X$. Let b be an integer contained in $2^{2+d} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then there exists a positive constant C_{2+d} satisfying the following:*

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a||_{L^p_{2,P}},\ ||\varphi^b \cdot \Theta_a^\dagger||_{L^p_{2,P}}\Big\} \le C_{2+d}(b) \cdot Q(P)^{3+d}.$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 2.53. ▮

Lemma 2.54 *For any $b \in 2^{d+k} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists a positive constant $C_{d+k}(b)$ satisfying the following:*

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^b\Theta||_{L^p_{k,P}}, ||\varphi^b\Theta^\dagger||_{L^p_{k,P}}\Big\} \le C_{k+d}(b) \cdot Q(P)^{d+k+1}.$$

Proof We can show it by a standard boot strapping argument. ▮

We put $K_0 := \overline{\Delta}_\zeta(1/3)^d$.

Corollary 2.10 *Let k be an integer, and p be any sufficiently large number. There exist positive constants M and C such that the L^p_k-norms and C^k-norms of $\Theta_{|K_0\times\{P\}}$ and $\Theta^\dagger_{|K_0\times\{P\}}$ are dominated by $C \cdot Q(P)^M$.*

Proof Let us pick a real number k_1 such that we have the continuous inclusion $L^p_k(\boldsymbol{R}^d) \subset C^k(\boldsymbol{R}^d)$. Then we can pick b_1, C_1 and M_1 such that the following holds, due to Lemma 2.54:

$$\max\Big\{||\varphi^{b_1} \cdot \Theta||_{L^p_{k_1,P}}, ||\varphi^{b_1} \cdot \Theta^\dagger||_{L^p_{k_1,P}}\Big\} \le C_1 \cdot Q(P)^{M_1}.$$

Then we obtain the estimate for C^k-norms of $\varphi^{b_1}\Theta$ and $\varphi^{b_1}\Theta^\dagger$. Since φ is identically 1 on a neighbourhood of K_0 by our choice of φ. Thus we obtain the result. ▮

2.9.3 Estimate for the differential of $\Theta^{\dagger}_{\zeta}$

Let us consider the case $\eta_i = dz_i/z_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$. We have the vector fields $V_i := z_i\partial/\partial z_i$, and $\partial f = \sum V_i(f) \wedge \eta_i$ and $\overline{\partial} f = \sum \overline{V}_i(f) \wedge \overline{\eta}_i$.

Lemma 2.55 *We have the following relation:*

$$\overline{\partial}\Theta^{\dagger} + \big[K - \lambda \cdot \Theta^{\dagger},\ \Theta^{\dagger}\big] = 0.$$

Proof It follows from the relation $\overline{\partial}_E \theta^{\dagger} = 0$ and $\overline{\partial}_E = \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} - \lambda\theta^{\dagger}$. ∎

We obtain the following relation for any $\zeta = \zeta_j$ and $i = 1, \ldots, m$:

$$\overline{V}_i \Theta^{\dagger}_{\zeta} - \overline{\partial}_{\zeta}\Theta^{\dagger}_{\eta_i} + \big[K_{\eta_i} - \lambda\Theta^{\dagger}_{\eta_i},\ \Theta^{\dagger}_{\zeta}\big] - \big[K_{\zeta} - \lambda\Theta^{\dagger}_{\zeta},\ \Theta^{\dagger}_{\eta_i}\big] = 0.$$

Hence we obtain the following:

Lemma 2.56 *There exist positive constants C and M such that the functions $\overline{V}_i\Theta^{\dagger}_{\zeta_j}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m,\ j = 1, \ldots, d)$ are dominated by $C \cdot Q(P)^M$ on $K_0 \times X_0$.* ∎

2.10 Convergency of the sequence of harmonic bundles

Although we do not use the argument to take a 'limit' of a sequence of harmonic bundles, contrary to the previous paper [38], the author thinks that such convergency seems significant for the study of harmonic bundles. We can improve the argument for the convergency in [38] by using the estimate in the subsubsection 2.9.2. We explain it in this subsection. In this subsection, we assume that $\lambda \neq 0$.

2.10.1 Convergency of the sequences of the Higgs fields $\Theta^{(n)}$ and the adjoint maps $\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}$

Let X be $\Delta^{*\,l} \times \Delta^{d-l}$, and $(E^{(n)}, \theta^{(n)}, h^{(n)})$ be a harmonic bundles on X such that $\mathrm{rank}(E^{(n)}) = r$. Recall that we have the deformed holomorphic bundles $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(n)}, d''^{\,\lambda\,(n)}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,(n)}, h^{(n)})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda} = \{\lambda\} \times X \subset \mathcal{X}$. In this subsection, the metric and the measure of X are $\sum_{i=1}^{n} dz_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{n} |dz_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i|$.

Assume that we are given holomorphic frames $\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} = (w_1^{(n)}, \ldots, w_r^{(n)})$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(n)}$. Then we have the elements $\Theta^{(n)} \in C^{\infty}\big(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}\big)$ determined by $\theta^{(n)}\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} \cdot \Theta^{(n)}$. We also have the elements $\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)} \in C^{\infty}(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega^{0,1}_X)$ determined by $\theta^{(n)\dagger}\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{w}^{(n)}\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}$.

We assume the following condition.

Condition 2.1

1. *We have the holomorphic λ-connection forms $A^{(n)} \in \Gamma(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}_X)$ determined by $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,(n)}\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} \cdot A^{(n)}$. Then the sequence $\big\{A^{(n)}\big\}$ converges to $A^{(\infty)} \in \Gamma(X, M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}_X)$ on any compact subset $Y \subset X$.*
2. *On any compact subset $Y \subset X$, $\big\{\Theta^{(n)}\big\}$ and $\big\{\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}\big\}$ are bounded independently of n.* ∎

Let Y be a compact subset of X. We put as follows:

$$Q^{(n)}_Y := ||\Theta^{(n)}||_{L^{\infty}(Y)} + ||\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}||_{L^{\infty}(Y)} + ||A^{(n)}||_{L^{\infty}(Y)}.$$

Then we have a positive constant C_Y independent of n such that $Q^{(n)}_Y \leq C_Y$ for any integer n due to Condition 2.1.

Lemma 2.57 *Let k be a positive number. There exist positive constants C and M such that L^p_k-norms and C^k-norms of $\Theta^{(n)}_{|Y}$ and $\Theta^{(n)\dagger}_{|Y}$ are dominated by $C \cdot C_Y^M$.*

Proof Since we have the boundedness of $Q^{(n)}_Y$, we can use Corollary 2.10. Note that we use the holomorphic frames $\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)}$, the term $||K||_{L^{\infty}}$ is trivial. ∎

Corollary 2.11 *There exists a subsequence* $\{n_i\}$ *such that* $\big\{\Theta^{(n_i)}_{|Y}\big\}$ *and* $\big\{\Theta^{(n_i)\dagger}_{|Y}\big\}$ *are convergent in the* C^∞*-sense.*

Proof We have only to use Lemma 2.57 and an easy diagonal argument. ■

Proposition 2.5 *There exists a subsequence* $\{n_i\}$ *such that* $\big\{\Theta^{(n_i)}_{|Y}\big\}$ *and* $\big\{\Theta^{(n_i)\dagger}_{|Y}\big\}$ *are convergent on any compact subset* $Y \subset X$ *in the* C^∞*-sense.*

Proof We have only to use Corollary 2.11 and an easy diagonal argument. ■

2.10.2 The convergency of $\big\{H^{(n)}\big\}$

Besides Condition 2.1, we consider the following additional condition:

Condition 2.2

- *We put* $H^{(n)} := H(h^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{w}^{(n)}) \in C^\infty\big(X, \mathcal{H}(r)\big)$. *On any compact subset* $Y \subset X$, $\big\{H^{(n)}\big\}$ *and* $\big\{H^{(n)\,-1}\big\}$ *are bounded independently of* n. *Namely we have a constant* C_Y *depending on* Y *such that* $\big|H^{(n)}\big| < C_Y$ *and* $\big|H^{(n)\,-1}\big| < C_Y$. ■

Due to Proposition 2.5, we may assume that $\big\{\Theta^{(n)}\big\}$ and $\big\{\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}\big\}$ are convergent on any compact subset Y in the C^∞-sense, by picking a subsequence.

We have the unitary connection $\nabla^{(n)} := \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(n)}} + \partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(n)}}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(n)}$. Let $B^{(n)}$ denote the connection form of $\nabla^{(n)}$, i.e., $\nabla^{(n)}\boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} = \boldsymbol{w}^{(n)} \cdot B^{(n)}$. Then we have the following by a standard theory:

$$B^{(n)} = H^{(n)\,-1}\partial H^{(n)}. \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, we have $\nabla^{(n)} = \mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,(n)} - 2\theta^{(n)}$. Hence we obtain the following relation:

$$B^{(n)} = A^{(n)} - \lambda^{-1}\big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big) \cdot \Theta^{(n)}. \tag{31}$$

Let Y be a compact subset of X, and we pick the function φ as in the previous subsubsection. Let us pick a compact subset $Y \subset X$, and let pick compact subsets Y_1 and Y_2 of X such that Y is contained in the interior of Y_1, and that Y_1 is contained in the interior of Y_2. We can pick an element $\varphi \in C^\infty(X, \boldsymbol{R})$, satisfying the following:

$$0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1, \quad \varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & (x \in Y) \\ 0 & (x \notin Y_2) \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.58 *We have the following formula:*

$$\partial\big(\varphi^{2b} H^{(n)}\big) = \varphi^b \cdot H^{(n)} \cdot \big(\varphi^b A^{(n)} - \varphi^b \lambda^{-1}\big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)\Theta^{(n)}\big) + 2\partial\varphi^b \cdot \varphi^b H^{(n)}. \tag{32}$$

Proof We obtain the following relation due to (30) and (31):

$$\partial H^{(n)} = H^{(n)} \cdot \big(A^{(n)} - 2 \cdot \lambda^{-1}\big(1 + |\lambda|^1\big)\Theta^{(n)}\big).$$

Then (32) follows immediately. ■

Lemma 2.59 *Let* $\{n_i\}$ *be a subsequence of* $\{n\}$.

- *Assume* $\big\{\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *is bounded in* L^p_k, *and* $\big\{\partial\big(\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big)\big\}$ *is bounded in* L^p_k. *Then* $\big\{\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *is bounded in* L^p_k *is bounded in* L^p_{k+1}.
- *Assume* $\big\{\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *is bounded in* L^p_k, *and* $\big\{\partial\big(\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big)\big\}$ *is convergent in* L^p_k. *Then* $\big\{\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *is bounded in* L^p_k *is convergent in* L^p_{k+1}.

Proof Note that we have $\overline{\varphi \cdot H_{i\,j}} = \varphi \cdot H_{j\,i}$. Hence we have the following:

$$\overline{\overline{\partial}\big(\varphi \cdot H_{i\,j}\big)} = \partial\big(\varphi \cdot H_{j\,i}\big).$$

Thus the estimate for ∂H implies the estimate for $\overline{\partial} H$. Thus we obtain the result. ▮

Lemma 2.60 *There exists a subsequence* $\{n_i\}$ *such that* $\{\varphi^{2b} \cdot H^{(n_i)}\}$ *are convergent in* L_0^p *for any* $b \in 2 \cdot \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof Due to (32) and Lemma 2.59, we have the boundedness of the family $\{\varphi^{2b} \cdot H^{(n_i)}\}$ are bounded in L_1^p. Then we obtain the result due to the compactness of the inclusion $L_1^p \subset L_0^p$. ▮

Lemma 2.61 *Let* $\{n_i\}$ *be the subsequence as in Lemma* 2.60. *Then* $\big\{H^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *are convergent on the compact subset* Y *in the* L_l^p*-sense for any* l.

Proof Let k be a positive integer. For any sufficiently large integer b, the family $\{\varphi^b \cdot H^{(n_i)}\}$ are convergent in L_k^p-sense, by using (32) and the bootstrapping argument. Since $\varphi = 1$ on a neighbourhood of K, we obtain the result. ▮

Proposition 2.6 *Assume the conditions in Condition* 2.1 *and Condition* 2.2 *are satisfied. There exists a subsequence* $\{n_i\}$ *such that* $\big\{H^{(n_i)}\big\}$, $\big\{\Theta^{(n_i)}\big\}$ *and* $\big\{\Theta^{\dagger\,(n_i)}\big\}$ *are convergent on any compact subset* Y *in the* C^∞*-sense.*

Proof We have already seen the convergency of $\big\{\Theta^{(n)}\big\}$ and $\big\{\Theta^{\dagger\,(n)}\big\}$ for some subsequence in Proposition 2.5. We have seen the convergency of $\{H^{(n)}\}$ on any compact subset for some subsequence in Lemma 2.61. Then we have only to use the diagonal argument. ▮

2.11 Higgs field and twisted map

2.11.1 A description of Higgs field

Let X be a complex manifold, and let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a harmonic bundle over X. Let $(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathbb{D}^\lambda)$ be the corresponding λ-connection, and $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,f}$ denote the associated flat connection. We have the decomposition $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,f} = d' + d''$ into the $(1,0)$-part and the $(0,1)$-part. Let δ' denote the $(1,0)$-operator such that $d'' + \delta'$ is a unitary connection. Let δ'' denote the $(0,1)$-operator such that $d' + \delta''$ is a unitary connection. Then we have the following formula:

$$d' = \partial + \lambda^{-1} \cdot \theta, \quad d'' = \overline{\partial} + \lambda \cdot \theta^\dagger, \quad \delta' = \partial - \overline{\lambda} \cdot \theta, \quad \delta'' = \overline{\partial} - \overline{\lambda}^{-1} \cdot \theta^\dagger.$$

It can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial &= \lambda \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \big(\overline{\lambda} \cdot d' + \lambda^{-1} \cdot \delta'\big) & \overline{\partial} &= \overline{\lambda} \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \big(\overline{\lambda}^{-1} \cdot d'' + \lambda \cdot \delta''\big), \\ \theta &= \lambda \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \big(d' - \delta'\big), & \theta^\dagger &= \overline{\lambda} \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \big(d'' - \delta''\big). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a flat frame with respect to the flat connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,f}$. We put $H = H(h, \boldsymbol{v})$. We have the C^∞-section Θ and $\Theta^\dagger$ of $M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}$ and $M(r) \otimes \Omega^{0,1}$ respectively, determined by the relations $\theta \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \Theta$ and $\theta^\dagger \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \Theta^\dagger$ respectively. Then we have the following relation:

$$\overline{\partial} H_{i\,j} = \overline{\partial} h(v_i, v_j) = h(v_i, \delta' v_j) = -h\big(v_i, (d' - \delta') v_j\big) = -h\big(v_i, \lambda^{-1} \cdot (1 + |\lambda|^2) \theta v_j\big) = -\overline{\lambda}^{-1} \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big) \cdot H_{i\,j} \cdot \overline{\Theta_{k\,j}}.$$

Hence we obtain the relation $\Theta = -\lambda \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \overline{H} \cdot \partial \overline{H}$. Similarly, we obtain the relation $\Theta^\dagger = -\overline{\lambda} \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^1\big)^{-1} \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot \overline{\partial} \overline{H}$.

Hence we have the following relation:

$$\overline{\lambda} \cdot \Theta + \lambda \cdot \Theta^\dagger = |\lambda|^2 \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot d\overline{H}.$$

Let v be a real vector field on X. Hence we obtain the following equality, by using Lemma 2.24:

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\overline{\lambda} \cdot \theta(v) + \lambda \cdot \theta^\dagger(v)\big|_h^2 &= \big|\lambda\big|^2 \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{tr}\Big(\overline{H}^{-1} \cdot d\overline{H}(v) \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot d\overline{H}(v) \cdot \overline{H}^{-1} \cdot \overline{H}\Big) \\ &= \big|\lambda\big|^2 \cdot \big(1 + |\lambda|^2\big)^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{tr}\Big(H^{-1} \cdot dH(v) \cdot H^{-1} \cdot dH(v)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

2.11.2 Higgs field as the differential of the twisted map

Let $\pi : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ be a universal covering. Recall that $\mathcal{PH}(r)$ denote the sets of the $(r \times r)$-positive definite hermitian matrices. By taking a flat trivialization of the flat bundle $\pi^{-1}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda\, f}\bigr)$, we obtain the equivariant map $\Psi_h : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow \mathcal{PH}(r)$, which is essentially independent of a choice of a flat trivialization.

We have the $\pi_1(X)$-action on $\tilde{X}$. The monodromy induces endomorphism $\rho : \pi_1(X) \longrightarrow GL(r)$, which induces the $\pi_1(X)$-action on $\mathcal{PH}(r)$. The map Ψ_h is equivariant with respect to the actions of the fundamental group $\pi_1(X)$.

The map Ψ_h is called the twisted map associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda\, f}, h)$. We often regard it as a map $\Psi_h : X \longrightarrow \mathcal{PH}(r)/\pi_1(X)$, although $\mathcal{PH}(r)/\pi_1(X)$ is not a good topological space in general.

Then the equality (33) can be reformulated as follows, by using Lemma 2.25:

$$\bigl|\overline{\lambda} \cdot \theta(v) + \lambda \cdot \theta^{\dagger}(v)\bigr|^2 = |\lambda|^4 \cdot \bigl(1 + |\lambda|^2\bigr)^{-1} \cdot \bigl|d\Psi_h(v)\bigr|^2. \tag{34}$$

3 Preliminary for mixed twistor structure

3.1 $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$

3.1.1 Y-holomorphic structure

Let X be a C^{∞}-manifold and Y be a complex manifold. Let V be a C^{∞}-vector bundle over $X \times Y$. Let p_Y denote the projection of $X \times Y$ onto Y.

Definition 3.1 *A Y-holomorphic structure of V is defined to be a differential operator $d''_{V,Y} : C^{\infty}(V) \longrightarrow C^{\infty}(V \otimes p_Y^{*}\Omega_Y^{0,1})$ satisfying the following:*

- $(d''_{V,Y})^2 = 0$.
- *For any function $f \in C^{\infty}\bigl(X \times Y\bigr)$ and any section $s \in C^{\infty}\bigl(X \times Y, V\bigr)$, the following holds:*

$$d''_{V,Y}(f \cdot s) = \overline{\partial}_Y(f) \cdot s + f \cdot d''_{V,Y} s.$$

The pair $(V, d''_{V,Y})$ or V is called a Y-holomorphic vector bundle. We often denote d'' instead of $d''_{V,Y}$. ▮

Definition 3.2 *Let (V, d'') be a Y-holomorphic vector bundle. A Y-holomorphic section of V is a C^{∞}-section s of V such that $d''(s) = 0$.* ▮

Let $(V, d''_{V,Y})$ be a Y-holomorphic vector bundle. Then the Y-holomorphic structure on the dual $V^{\vee}$ is naturally defined. Let $(V^{(i)}, d''_{V^{(i)},Y})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be Y-holomorphic vector bundles over $X \times Y$. Then the tensor product and the direct sum of $(V^{(i)}, d''_{V^{(i)},Y})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ are naturally defined.

Definition 3.3 *Let $(V^{(i)}, d''_{V^{(i)},Y})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be Y-holomorphic vector bundles over $X \times Y$. A morphism of $(V^{(1)}, d''_{V^{(1)},Y})$ to $(V^{(2)}, d''_{V^{(2)},Y})$ is defined to be a Y-holomorphic section of $Hom(V^{(1)}, V^{(2)})$.* ▮

3.1.2 Some description of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$

We are particularly interested in the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$. It is often useful to consider the following object. In the following, we regard $\mathbb{P}^1$ as the gluing of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}$ by the relation $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$.

Definition 3.4 *A patched object on X is defined to be a tuple $(V_{\lambda}, V_{\mu}, \varphi)$ as follows:*

- *V_a is a $\boldsymbol{C}_a$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_a$ for $a = \lambda, \mu$.*
- *We have the $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$-holomorphic vector bundles $V_{\lambda\,|\,X \times \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}}$ and $V_{\mu\,|\,X \times \boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}^{*}}$ over $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$. Then φ is a $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$-holomorphic isomorphism of $V_{\lambda\,|\,X \times \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}}$ to $V_{\mu\,|\,X \times \boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}^{*}}$.* ▮

Definition 3.5 *Let* $(V_\lambda^{(i)}, V_\mu^{(i)}, \varphi^{(i)})$ $(i=1,2)$ *be patched objects over* X. *A morphism* f *of* $(V_\lambda^{(1)}, V_\mu^{(1)}, \varphi^{(1)})$ *to* $(V_\lambda^{(2)}, V_\mu^{(2)}, \varphi^{(2)})$ *is defined to be a tuple* (f_λ, f_μ), *where* f_a $(a=\lambda,\mu)$ *is a* $\boldsymbol{C}_a$*-holomorphic morphism* $V_a^{(1)} \longrightarrow V_a^{(2)}$ *which is compatible with* $\varphi^{(1)}$ *and* $\varphi^{(2)}$. $\blacksquare$

A direct sum, a tensor product and a dual are naturally defined.

Equivalence
Let $(V_\lambda, V_\mu, \varphi)$ be a patched object over X. By gluing them, we obtain the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. On the other hand, let V be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$, we put $V_a := V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_a}$ for $a=\lambda,\mu$. We have the naturally defined isomorphism $\mathrm{id} : V_{\lambda\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*} \longrightarrow V_{\mu\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}$. Thus we obtain the patched object. It is easy to check the equivalence of the category of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ and the category of the patched object over X. The equivalence preserves a tensor product, a direct sum and a dual.

Another description
We can also consider another kind of patched objects $(V_0, V_1, V_\infty; \alpha_0, \alpha_\infty)$ as follows: For simplicity, we put $Y_0 := \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $Y_\infty := \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ and $Y_1 := \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$.

- V_a be a Y_a-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times Y_a$.
- We have the Y_1-holomorphic vector bundles $V_{a\,|\,Y_1}$ $(a=0,1,\infty)$. Then α is a Y_1-holomorphic morphism $V_{a\,|\,Y_1} \longrightarrow V_1$ $(a=0,\infty)$.

We can naturally define the morphism of such patched objects. We also have a tensor product, a direct sum and a dual of such objects. As before we have the naturally defined equivalence of the category of such patched objects and the category of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

Due to the equivalences explained above, we will often use the descriptions (V_λ, V_μ) or $(V_0, V_\infty, V_1; \alpha, \beta)$ to denote a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$, in the following.

3.1.3 The involution σ and the induced bundles

Let σ denote the morphism $\mathbb{P}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ given by $[z_0 : z_\infty] \longmapsto [\bar{z}_\infty : -\bar{z}_0]$. We also use the notation σ to denote the following induced morphisms:

- $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ given by $\sigma^*\mu = -\overline{\lambda}$.
- $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ given by $\sigma^*\lambda = -\overline{\mu}$.
- $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^* \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ given by $\lambda \longmapsto -\overline{\lambda}^{-1}$.

We take the anti-linear isomorphism $\varphi : C^\infty(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda)$ by $\varphi(f) = \sigma^*(\overline{f})$. It is induced by the conjugate map $\varphi_0 : \sigma^*\boldsymbol{C}_{X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}_{X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ given by $a \longmapsto \overline{a}$, where $\boldsymbol{C}_Y$ denotes the trivial line bundle over a C^∞-manifold Y.

Since the morphism σ is anti-holomorphic, we have the naturally induced isomorphism $\sigma^*\Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu} \longrightarrow \Omega^{1,0}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ given by $\sigma^*(a\cdot d\overline{\mu}) \longmapsto -\sigma^*(a)\cdot d\lambda$. On the other hand, we have the conjugate $\Omega^{1,0}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ given by $a\cdot d\lambda \longmapsto \overline{a}\cdot d\overline{\lambda}$, which is anti-linear. As the composite, we obtain the linear morphism $\varphi_0 : \sigma(\Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}) \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$. They induces the morphism $\varphi : C^\infty\big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu, \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\big) \longrightarrow C^\infty\big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\big)$ given by $f\cdot d\overline{\mu} \longmapsto -\sigma^*(\overline{f})\cdot d\overline{\lambda}$.

Let f be an element of $C^\infty(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu)$. Then we obtain the elements $\varphi(f)\in C^\infty(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda)$ and $\overline{\partial}_\lambda\varphi(f) \in C^\infty\big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\big)$. On the other hand, we have the elements $\overline{\partial}_\mu f \in C^\infty\big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu, \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\big)$. We also have the element $\varphi\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu f\big) \in C^\infty\big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\big)$.

Lemma 3.1 *We have the equality* $\overline{\partial}_\lambda\varphi(f) = \varphi\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu f\big)$. *Namely, we have* $\overline{\partial}_\lambda\circ\varphi = \varphi\circ\overline{\partial}_\mu$.

Proof We have the following:

$$\varphi\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \overline{\mu}} d\overline{\mu}\Big) = -\sigma^* \overline{\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \overline{\mu}}\Big)} \cdot d\overline{\lambda} = -\sigma^* \left(\frac{\partial \overline{f}}{\partial \mu}\right) d\overline{\lambda}. \tag{35}$$

We have the following equalities:

$$\sigma^* \left(\frac{\partial \overline{f}}{\partial \mu}\right)(z,\lambda) = \frac{\partial \overline{f}}{\partial \mu}(z,-\overline{\lambda}) = -\frac{\partial \overline{f}(z,-\overline{\lambda})}{\partial \overline{\lambda}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{\lambda}}\big(\varphi(f)(z,\lambda)\big). \tag{36}$$

From (35) and (36), we obtain the result. ∎

Let V be a C^∞-vector bundle over $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu \times X$. Then we obtain the pull back $\sigma^* V$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times X$. We change the $\boldsymbol{C}$-vector bundle structure of $\sigma^* V$ as follows: For a complex number $a \in \boldsymbol{C}$ and an element $\sigma^*(v) \in \sigma^* V_{|(\lambda,P)}$, $a \cdot \sigma^*(v)$ is defined to be $\sigma^*(\overline{a} \cdot v)$. We denote the resulted C^∞-vector bundle by $\sigma(V)$. The anti-linear morphisms φ_0 given above can be regarded as the linear morphisms $\sigma \boldsymbol{C}_{X\times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}_{X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ or $\sigma\Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu} \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$.

Then the morphism φ_0 induces the following isomorphism

$$\varphi_0 : \sigma\big(V \otimes \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\big) \longrightarrow \sigma\big(V\big) \otimes \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}, \quad \varphi_0\big(\sigma(v\otimes d\overline{\mu})\big) = -\sigma(v) \otimes d\overline{\lambda}.$$

It induces the morphism $\varphi_0 : C^\infty\Big(X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, \sigma\big(V \otimes \Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\big)\Big) \longrightarrow C^\infty\Big(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, \sigma\big(V\big)\otimes\Omega^{0,1}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\Big)$.

Let $(V, \overline{\partial}_\mu)$ be a $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$. Then the differential operator $\overline{\partial}_\lambda$ on $\sigma(V)$ is defined as follows:

$$\overline{\partial}_\lambda(\sigma(v)) = \varphi_0\big(\sigma(\overline{\partial}_\mu v)\big).$$

Lemma 3.2 *The operator $\overline{\partial}_\lambda$ gives the $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$-holomorphic structure of $\sigma(V)$.*

Proof We have the following:

$$\overline{\partial}_\lambda\big(f\cdot\sigma(v)\big) = \overline{\partial}_\lambda\big(\sigma(\varphi(f)\cdot v)\big) = \varphi_0\big(\sigma\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu(\varphi(f)\cdot v)\big)\big) = \varphi_0\big(\sigma\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu\varphi(f)\cdot v + \varphi(f)\cdot\overline{\partial}_\mu v\big)\big) \tag{37}$$

We have the following:

$$\varphi_0\sigma\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu\varphi(f)\cdot v\big) = \varphi_0\sigma\big(\varphi(\overline{\partial}_\lambda f)\big)\cdot\sigma(v) = \overline{\partial}_\lambda f\cdot\sigma(v). \tag{38}$$

We also have the following:

$$\varphi_0\big(\sigma\big(\varphi(f)\cdot\overline{\partial}_\mu v\big)\big) = f\cdot\varphi_0\big(\sigma\big(\overline{\partial}_\mu v\big)\big).$$

It is easy to check that $\overline{\partial}_\lambda^2 = 0$. Thus we are done. ∎

Namely we obtain the induced $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$-holomorphic vector bundle $\sigma(V)$ from a $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$-holomorphic vector bundle V. Similarly, a Y-holomorphic vector bundle V induces the $\sigma(Y)$-holomorphic vector bundle $\sigma(V)$ for $Y = \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$, $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ and $\mathbb{P}^1$.

3.2 Equivariant $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundle over $X \times \mathbb{P}^1$

3.2.1 Torus action

Let ρ_0 denote the G_m-action on $\mathbb{P}^1$ given as follows:

$$\rho_0\big(t, [z_0 : z_\infty]\big) = [t\cdot z_0 : z_\infty].$$

It induces the G_m-action on $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$, which we also denote by ρ_0. We have the open subsets $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ and $X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ of $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. They are stable with respect to ρ_0.

Let V be a C^∞-vector bundle over $X\times Y$ for $Y = \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$, $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ or $\mathbb{P}^1$

When we consider the G_m-action on V, we consider only the action which is a lift of ρ_0. Assume that V is holomorphic along the $\mathbb{P}^1$-direction. Let ρ be a G_m-action on V. It is called holomorphic if $t^*\overline{\partial}_\lambda = \overline{\partial}_\lambda$ for any $t \in G_m$.

3.2.2 Rees bundle (one filtration)

Let p_0, p_∞ and p_1 denote the projection of $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ and $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ onto X. Let H be a C^∞-bundle over X, and F be a decreasing C^∞-filtration of H. Let us pick a point of P and a small neighbourhood U of P. We may assume that we have a frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ of $H_{|U}$ which is compatible with F. We put $b_i = \deg_F(v_i) = \max\{h \,|\, v_i \in F_h\}$. We put $\tilde{v}_i := \lambda^{-b_i} \cdot p_1^*(v_i)$. Then we obtain the frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := (\tilde{v}_i)$ of $p_1^* H_{|U}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^* \times U$. The frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a prolongation of $p_1^* H_{|U}$ to a vector bundle $\xi(H_{|U}; F)$ over $U \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.

Lemma 3.3 *The C^∞-bundle $\xi(H_{|U}, F)$ is independent of a choice of compatible frame $\boldsymbol{v}$.*

Proof Assume that $\boldsymbol{u}$ is other compatible frame. We have the following relation:

$$u_i = \sum b_{j\,i} \cdot v_j.$$

Here we have $b_{j\,i} = 0$ in the case $\deg_F(u_i) > \deg_F(v_j)$. Then we obtain the following relation.

$$\tilde{u}_i = \lambda^{-b(u_i)} \cdot u_i = \sum b_{j\,i} \cdot \lambda^{-b(u_i)+b(v_j)} \cdot \lambda^{-b(v_j)} \cdot v_j = \sum b_{j\,i} \cdot \lambda^{-b(u_i)+b(v_j)} \cdot \tilde{v}_j.$$

It implies the well definedness of $\xi(H_{|U}; F)$. ∎

Corollary 3.1 *We obtain the global C^∞-vector bundle $\xi(H; F)$, which is $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$-holomorphic.* ∎

It is characterized locally as follows: We may assume that $U = X$. We have the ring $C^\infty(X)[\lambda]$. We have the $C^\infty(X)[\lambda]$-module $C^\infty(X, H)[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}]$. We have the submodule of $C^\infty(X, H)[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}]$ given as follows:

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda^{-p} \cdot C^\infty(X, F^p)[\lambda].$$

By taking $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ as above, we can show that it is locally free, and $\xi(H_{|U}, F)$ is the corresponding vector bundle. The restriction $\xi(H; F)_{|\mathcal{X}^0}$ is naturally isomorphic to the associated graded vector bundle $\mathrm{Gr}_F(H) = \bigoplus_p \mathrm{Gr}_F^p(H)$.

The ρ_0 can be naturally lifted to the action on $p_1^*(H)$. It is easy to check that the action can be prolonged to the action on $\xi(H; F)$. Since $\mathcal{X}^0 := X \times \{0\}$ is fixed by the torus action, we obtain the weight decomposition of $\xi(H; F)_{|\mathcal{X}^0}$. It is given by the decomposition $\mathrm{Gr}_F(H) = \bigoplus_p \mathrm{Gr}_F^p(H)$, i.e., the weight on $\mathrm{Gr}_F^p(H)$ is p.

Let $\mathrm{Filt}(X)$ be the category of filtered C^∞-vector bundle over X. For two filtered bundles (H_i, F_i) $(i = 1, 2)$, a morphism $F : (H_1, F_1) \longrightarrow (H_2, F_2)$ is defined to be a morphism $H_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ preserving filtrations. Let $\mathrm{Equi}(X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda)$ be the C^∞-vector bundle with G_m-action over $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. For equivariant bundles V_i $(i = 1, 2)$, a morphism $f : V_1 \longrightarrow V_2$ is defined to be an equivariant $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$-holomorphic section of the equivariant bundle $\mathit{Hom}(V_1, V_2)$.

Let $f : (H_1, F) \longrightarrow (H_2, F)$ be a morphism. Let v be a section of $F^p(H_1)$. Then $f(v)$ is contained in $F^p(H_2)$. Hence $f(\lambda^{-p} \cdot v)$ gives a section of $\xi(H_2, F)$. Thus we obtain the section $\xi(f)$ of $\mathit{Hom}(V_1, V_2)$. It is easy to check that $\xi(f)$ is equivariant with respect to the torus action. Therefore we obtain the equivariant morphism $\xi(f) : V_1 \longrightarrow V_2$.

Let (H_i, F) $(i = 1, 2)$ be a filtered vector bundle. Recall that the filtration of the tensor product $H_1 \otimes H_2$ is defined as follows:

$$F^p(H_1 \otimes H_2) := \sum_{r+s \geq p} F^r(H_1) \otimes F^s(H_2).$$

Let (H, F) be a filtered vector bundle. Recall that the dual of (H, F) is defined as follows:

$$F^p(H^\vee) = \mathrm{Ker}\bigl(H^\vee \longrightarrow (F^{-p+1})^\vee\bigr).$$

Lemma 3.4 *ξ gives the fully faithful functor from* $\mathrm{Filt}(X)$ *to* $\mathrm{Equi}(X)$*. It preserves direct sums, tensor products and duals.*

Proof It is clear that ξ is a functor and that ξ preserves direct sums.

We pick a splittings $H_1=\bigoplus_p U_1^p$ and $H_2=\bigoplus_p U_2^p$ of the filtrations. Then the decomposition $H_1\otimes H_2=\bigoplus_p\bigoplus_{r+s=p}U_1^r\otimes U_2^s$ gives the splitting of the filtration of $H_1\otimes H_2$. Then it is easy to see that the tensor product $\xi(H_1,F)\otimes\xi(H_2,F)$ is isomorphic to $\xi\bigl((H_1,F)\otimes(H_2,F)\bigr)$.

We have the perfect pairing $H\otimes H^{\vee}\longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$. Due to the definition of $F(H^{\vee})$, the composite of the following morphisms is trivial for $i\geq -p+1$:

$$F^i(H)\otimes F^p(H^{\vee})\longrightarrow F^{-p+1}(H)\otimes F^p(H^{\vee})\longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}.$$

For any $v\in F^i(H)$ and $v^{\vee}\in F^p(H^{\vee})$, the pairing $\langle\lambda^{-p}\cdot v^{\vee},\lambda^{-i}\cdot v\rangle$ is contained in $\boldsymbol{C}[\lambda]$. It implies we have the equivariant morphism $\xi(H^{\vee},f)\longrightarrow\xi(H,f)^{\vee}$. By using the perfectness of $\mathrm{Gr}_F(H)\otimes\mathrm{Gr}_F(H^{\vee})\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}$, we obtain that $\xi(H^{\vee},F)$ is isomorphic to $\xi(H,F)^{\vee}$.

Let $\phi:\xi(H_1,F)\longrightarrow\xi(H_2,F)$ be an equivariant morphism. Then we obtain the morphism $f=\phi_{|\{1\}\times X}:H_1\longrightarrow H_2$. Since ϕ is equivariant, we have $\phi(\lambda^{-p}\cdot v)=\lambda^{-p}f(v)$. Let v be a section of $F^p(H_1)$. Since $\phi(\lambda^{-p}\cdot v)=\lambda^{-p}\cdot f(v)$ is a section of $\xi(H_2,F)$, $f(v)$ is contained in $F^p(H_2)$. Thus we are done. ▮

Remark 3.1 *In fact, the functor ξ gives the equivalence of two categories.* ▮

3.2.3 Rees bundle (bi-filtration)

Let H be a C^{∞}-vector bundle over X. Let F and G be filtrations of H in the C^{∞}-category. As we have already seen, we obtain the equivariant bundle $\xi(H;F)$ over $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. By a similar way, we obtain the equivariant bundle $\xi(H;G)$ over $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}$. Note that they are isomorphic to p_1^*H on $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*$. Hence we can glue them, and we obtain the equivariant vector bundle $\xi(H,F,G)$ over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Or, we can say that we obtain the patched object $\bigl(\xi(H,F),\xi(H,G),p_1^*H;\mathrm{id},\mathrm{id}\bigr)$.

Let $\mathrm{Bifilt}(X)$ be the category of bi-filtered C^{∞}-vector bundle over X. Let (H_i,F,G) $(i=1,2)$ be bi-filtered vector bundles over X. A morphism $f:(H_1,F,G)\longrightarrow(H_2,F,G)$ is defined to be a morphism $f:H_1\longrightarrow H_2$ preserving the filtrations F and G.

Let $\mathrm{Equi}(X\times\mathbb{P}^1)$ be the category of equivariant $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Let V_i $(i=1,2)$ be equivariant vector bundles over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. A morphism $f:V_1\longrightarrow V_2$ is defined to be an equivariant section of the equivariant bundle $\mathcal{H}om(V_1,V_2)$.

Let $f:(H_1,F,G)\longrightarrow(H_2,F,G)$ be a morphism of bi-filtered vector bundles. Then we obtain the morphism $\xi(f):\xi(H_1,F,G)\longrightarrow\xi(H_2,F,G)$.

Proposition 3.1 *The functor ξ gives an equivalence of two categories. It preserves direct sums, tensor products and duals. It is functorial for a C^{∞}-morphism $Y\longrightarrow X$.*

Proof We only show the equivalence of the categories, because the rests are easy. It follows easily from Lemma 3.4 that ξ is fully faithful. Thus we have only to show that ξ is essentially surjective.

Let V be an equivariant vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. We will construct the bi-filtered vector bundle (H,F,G). We put $H=V_{|\mathcal{X}^1}$, where we put $\mathcal{X}^1:=X\times\{1\}$. We will construct the filtrations F and G. We have only to construct them locally on X.

Let us pick a point P of X. The following lemmas are standard.

Lemma 3.5 *There exists a number n_0, such that the following holds for any $n\geq n_0$:*

1. *The following morphism is surjective:*

$$H^0\bigl(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,n)_{|\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}\bigr)\longrightarrow V\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,n)_{|\{P\}\times\{0\}}=V_{|\{P\}\times\{0\}}.$$

2. $H^1\bigl(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,n)_{|\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}\bigr)=0.$ ▮

Lemma 3.6 *We have a neighbourhood U of P in X satisfying the following:*

- *The properties 1 and 2 in Lemma 3.5 for any point $Q\in U$.*

- $\bigl\{H^0\bigl(V\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(0,n)_{|Q\times\mathbb{P}^1}\bigr)\bigm| Q\in U\bigr\}$ *forms a* C^{∞}*-vector bundle* $\mathcal{E}_n$ *on* U*.*

Proof It can be shown by arguments similar to those in the subsubsection 2.8.1. ▮

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 3.1. Then we have the equivariant surjective morphism $\pi:\mathcal{E}_n\longrightarrow V_{|\mathcal{X}^0}$ over X. If $n<n'$, then we have the commutativity $\mathcal{E}_n\subset\mathcal{E}_{n'}\longrightarrow V_{|\mathcal{X}^0}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$ be a C^{∞}-frame of $V_{|\mathcal{X}^0}$, which is compatible with the weight decomposition $V_{|\mathcal{X}^0}=\bigoplus U_h$. We denote the weight of v_i by w_i. Let $\tilde{v}_i$ be a C^{∞}-section of the weight w_i-part of $\mathcal{E}_n$ such that $\pi(\tilde{v}_i)=v_i$. Note that $\tilde{v}_i$ naturally give sections of $V\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,n)$, and they are $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$-holomorphic. Then there exists a neighbourhood U_1 of O in $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$, and a neighbourhood U_2 of P in X, such that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}=(\tilde{v}_i)$ gives a frame of $V\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,n)_{|U_1\times U_2}$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{n,h}$ denote the weight h-part of $\mathcal{E}_n$. The decreasing filtration F is defined as follows:

$$F^h:=\operatorname{Im}\Bigl(\bigoplus_{k\geq h}\mathcal{E}_{n,k}\longrightarrow H=V_{|\{1\}\times X}\Bigr).$$

Lemma 3.7 *We have* $\mathrm{Gr}_F^h\simeq U_h$*.*

Proof Let f be a section of the weight h-part of $\mathcal{E}_n$. Then there exist C^{∞}-functions $a_i(x,\lambda)$ which are $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$-holomorphic, such that the following holds:

$$f=\sum a_i(x,\lambda)\cdot\tilde{v}_i.$$

Due to the condition on the weight, the functions $a_i(x,\lambda)$ are described as $\tilde{a}_i(x)\cdot\lambda^{w_i-h}$ for C^{∞}-functions $\tilde{a}_i(x)$. Note that $\tilde{a}_i(x)=0$ if $w_i-h<0$. Then Lemma 3.7 follows. ▮

Lemma 3.8 *The construction of the subbundle* F^h *of* H *is independent of a choice of* n*.*

Proof Recall that we have $\mathcal{E}_n\longrightarrow\mathcal{E}_{n'}\longrightarrow V_{\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}$ for any $n\leq n'$ and for any λ. The lemma follows easily. ▮

Thus we obtain the well defined filtration F of H. We denote the image of $\tilde{v}_i$ by $\bar{v}_i$. We have the equivariant morphism $p_1^*H\longrightarrow V_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*}$, given by $\lambda^{-w_i}\cdot\bar{v}_i\longmapsto\tilde{v}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*\times X}$. It is prolonged to the equivariant isomorphism $\xi(H,F)\longrightarrow V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\times X}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\times X$.

Similarly, we obtain the filtration G by considering $V\otimes\mathcal{O}(n,0)$ and $V_{|\lambda=\infty}$, and we have the natural equivariant isomorphism $\xi(H,G)\longrightarrow V_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}}$. Then we obtain the isomorphism $\xi(H,F,G)\longrightarrow V$. Thus the proof of Proposition 3.1 is accomplished. ▮

Lemma 3.9 *An equivariant subbundle* W *of* $V=\xi(H,F,G)$ *corresponds to a subbundle* H' *of* H *with strict filtrations* $F'=F\cap H'$ *and* $G'=G\cap H'$*.*

Proof Let H' be a subbundle of H. We put $F'=F\cap H'$ and $G'=G\cap H'$. Then it is easy to check that $\xi(H',F',G')$ gives a subbundle of V.

Let W be a subbundle of V. We put $H'=W_{|\lambda=1}$, and then we obtain $\xi(H',F',G')$ as above. Due to the equivariance, the restrictions of W and $\xi(H',F',G')$ to $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*$ are same. It implies W and $\xi(H',F',G')$ are same. Thus we are done. ▮

3.2.4 Real structure of equivariant bundles

Let (V,ρ) be an equivariant vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. We have the G_m-action $\sigma(\rho)$ on $\sigma(V)$ defined as follows:

$$\sigma(\rho)(t)\cdot\bigl(\sigma(v)\bigr):=\sigma\bigl(\rho(\bar{t})^{-1}\cdot v\bigr).$$

On the other hand, we have the bi-filtered vector space (H,F,G) and the conjugate $(H^{\dagger},G^{\dagger},F^{\dagger})$.

Lemma 3.10 *If* $(V,\rho)=\xi(H,F,G)$*, then we have* $\bigl(\sigma(V),\sigma(\rho)\bigr)=\xi\bigl(H^{\dagger},G^{\dagger},F^{\dagger}\bigr)$*.*

Proof It directly follows from the definition. ▮

Definition 3.6 *A real structure on an equivariant bundle* (V,ρ) *is defined to be an equivariant isomorphism* $\iota_V : \big(\sigma(V),\sigma(\rho)\big) \simeq (V,\rho)$*, such that* $\iota_V \circ \sigma(\iota_V) = \mathrm{id}_V$*.* ▮

Remark 3.2 *In this paper, we do not consider the real structure of non-equivariant* $\mathbb{P}^1$*-holomorphic vector bundle. See the section* 2 *in* [52]*.* ▮

The real structure of (H,F,G) is defined to be the isomorphism $\iota_H : (H,F,G) \longrightarrow (H^\dagger, G^\dagger, F^\dagger)$. In other words, ι_H is anti-isomorphism $H \longrightarrow H$ and we have $G = F^\dagger$.

Lemma 3.11 *In the case* $(V,\rho) = \xi(H,F,G)$*, a real structure* ι_V *of* (V,ρ) *and a real structure* ι_H *of* $\xi(H,F,G)$ *corresponds by the relation* $\iota_V = \xi(\iota_H)$*.* ▮

Definition 3.7 *Let* (W,ρ_W) *be a vector subbundle of* (V,ρ)*. If we have* $\iota_V\big(\sigma(W)\big) \subset W$*, the subbundle* W *is called defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$*.* ▮

Lemma 3.12 *An equivariant subbundle* (W,ρ_W) *is defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$ *if and only if the subbundle* $H' = W_{|\lambda=1}$ *of* H *is defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$*.*

Proof We have the action of ι_V on $C^\infty(X,H)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]$, it is equivalent with $\iota_H \otimes \iota_0$. Here ι_0 is given by $\iota_0(\lambda) = -\lambda^{-1}$. Let us consider the following property:

$C^\infty(X,H')[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]$ is preserved by $\iota_V = \iota_H \otimes \iota_0$.

Then it is easy to see that three properties are equivalent. ▮

Definition 3.8 *Let* (V_i,ρ_i,ι_i) $(i=1,2)$ *be equivariant vector bundles defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$*. Let* $f : (V_1,\rho_1) \longrightarrow (V_2,\rho_2)$ *be an equivariant morphism. It is called defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$ *if* $\iota_2 \circ \sigma(f) = f \circ \iota_1$*.* ▮

Lemma 3.13 *Let* (H_i,F_i,G_i) $(i=1,2)$ *be bi-filtered vector bundles with real structures* ι_{H_i}*. We put* $(V_i,\rho_i) = \xi(H_i,F_i,G_i)$*. A morphism* $f : (V_1,\rho_1) \longrightarrow (V_2,\rho_2)$ *is defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$ *if and only if* $f = \xi(N)$ *and* $N : (H_1,F_1,G_1) \longrightarrow (H_2,F_2,G_2)$ *is defined over* $\boldsymbol{R}$*.*

Proof From f, we obtain the morphism $f' : C^\infty(X,H_1)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}] \longrightarrow C^\infty(X,H_2)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]$. Then the both properties are equivalent to the property that f' is compatible with $\boldsymbol{R}$-structure. ▮

3.3 Tate objects and $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$

3.3.1 Tate object

The following patched object is called the Tate object:

$$\mathbb{T}(n) = \Big(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\cdot t_0^{(n)},\ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot t_\infty^{(n)},\ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}\cdot t_1^{(n)},\ \alpha_0^{(n)},\ \alpha_\infty^{(n)}\Big).$$

Here the morphisms $\alpha_0^{(n)}$ and $\alpha_\infty^{(n)}$ are given as follows:

$$\alpha_0^{(n)}(t_0^{(n)}) = (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^n \cdot t_1^{(n)}, \quad \alpha_\infty^{(n)}(t_\infty^{(n)}) = \big(-\sqrt{-1}\mu\big)^n \cdot t_1^{(n)}.$$

The vector bundle corresponding to the patched object above can be regarded as the gluing of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\cdot t_0^{(n)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot t_\infty^{(n)}$ by the relation $(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-n}\cdot t_0^{(n)} = (-\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{-n}\cdot t_\infty^{(n)}$, i.e., $(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2n}\cdot t_0^{(n)} = t_\infty^{(n)}$. Hence it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2n)$. We denote the corresponding vector bundle also by $\mathbb{T}(n)$ or $\mathcal{O}(-2n)$ for simplicity.

By the projection $\pi : X\times\mathbb{P}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, we obtain the patched object $\pi^*\mathbb{T}(n)$ over X, which we denote by $\mathbb{T}(n)_X$ or $\mathbb{T}(n)$ for simplicity.

We have the torus action $\rho_{\mathbb{T}(n)}$ on $\mathbb{T}(n)$ given as follows:

$$(t,t_0^{(n)}) \longmapsto t^n\cdot t_0^{(n)}, \quad (t,t_\infty^{(n)}) \longmapsto t^{-n}\cdot t_\infty^{(n)}, \quad (t,t_1^{(n)}) \longmapsto t_1^{(n)}.$$

We have the isomorphism $\iota_{\mathbb{T}(n)} : \sigma^*\mathbb{T}(n) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(n)$ given as follows:

$$\sigma^*(t_0^{(n)}) \longmapsto (-1)^n \cdot t_\infty^{(n)}, \quad \sigma^*(t_\infty^{(n)}) \longmapsto (-1)^n \cdot t_0^{(n)}, \quad \sigma^*(t_1^{(n)}) \longmapsto t_1^{(n)}.$$

Note that it is well defined as it can be checked as follows:

$$\sigma^* t_\infty^{(n)} = \sigma\bigl((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2n} \cdot t_0^{(n)}\bigr) = (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{-2n} \cdot \sigma^* t_0^{(n)} \longmapsto (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{-2n} \cdot (-1)^n \cdot t_\infty^{(n)} = (-1)^n \cdot t_0^{(n)},$$

$$\sigma^* t_1^{(n)} = \sigma^*\bigl((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-n} \cdot t_0^{(n)}\bigr) = (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{-n} \cdot \sigma^* t_0^{(n)} \longmapsto (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{-n} \cdot (-1)^n \cdot t_\infty^{(n)} = t_1^{(n)}.$$

Lemma 3.14 *We have $\iota_{\mathbb{T}(n)} \circ \sigma^*\bigl(\iota_{\mathbb{T}(n)}\bigr) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{T}(n)}$. Namely, the morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{T}(n)}$ gives the real structure of $\mathbb{T}(n)$.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ■

We have the corresponding real structure on $\mathbb{T}(n)_{|\lambda=1}$. In the following, the real base $t^{(n)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}$ is fixed.

3.3.2 $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(n)$

We have the following patched object:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(p,q) = \Bigl(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\cdot f_0^{(p,q)},\ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot f_\infty^{(p,q)},\ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}\cdot f_1^{(p,q)},\ \alpha_0^{(p,q)},\ \alpha_\infty^{(p,q)}\Bigr).$$

Here the morphism $\alpha_0^{(p,q)}$ and $\alpha_\infty^{(p,q)}$ are given as follows:

$$\alpha_0^{(p,q)}\bigl(f_0^{(p,q)}\bigr) = \bigl(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\bigr)^{-p} \cdot f_1^{(p,q)}, \qquad \alpha_\infty^{(p,q)}(f_\infty^{(p,q)}) = \bigl(-\sqrt{-1}\mu\bigr)^{-q} \cdot f_1^{(p,q)}.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ is the vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ obtained as the gluing of $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(p,q)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu} \cdot f_\infty^{(p,q)}$ by the relation $\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\bigr)^{p+q} \cdot f_0^{p,q} = f_\infty^{p,q}$, it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(p+q)$. We also note that we have the canonical isomorphism $\phi_{(p,q),(p',q')} : \mathcal{O}(p,q) \simeq \mathcal{O}(p',q')$ in the case $p+q = p'+q'$, which is given as follows:

$$f_0^{(p,q)} \longmapsto f_0^{(p',q')}, \qquad f_\infty^{(p,q)} \longmapsto f_\infty^{(p',q')}. \tag{39}$$

In this sense, we may also use $f_0^{(n)}$ and $f_\infty^{(n)}$ instead of $f_0^{(p,q)}$ and $f_\infty^{(p,q)}$, when we forget the torus action and we have $p+q = n$.

We denote $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{O}(p,q))$ by $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ or $\mathcal{O}(p+q)$ for simplicity. Let $\pi_X : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ denote the projection. The induced patched objects $\pi_X^*\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ are denoted by $\mathcal{O}(p,q)_X$ or simply by $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$.

We have the torus action $\rho_{(p,q)}$ on $\mathcal{O}(p,q)$ given as follows:

$$(t, f_0^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto t^p \cdot f_0^{(p,q)}, \quad (t, f_\infty^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto t^{-q} \cdot f_\infty^{(p,q)}, \quad (t, f_1^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto f_1^{(p,q)}.$$

The isomorphism $\phi_{(p,q),(p',q')}$ is not compatible with the torus actions, if $(p,q) \neq (p',q')$.

We have the isomorphism $\iota_{(p,q)} : \sigma^*\mathcal{O}(p,q) \simeq \mathcal{O}(q,p)$ given as follows:

$$\sigma^*(f_0^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto \sqrt{-1}^{\,p+q} f_\infty^{(q,p)},$$

$$\sigma^*(f_\infty^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto (-\sqrt{-1})^{p+q} f_0^{(q,p)},$$

$$\sigma^*(f_1^{(p,q)}) \longmapsto \sqrt{-1}^{\,q-p} f_1^{(q,p)}.$$

Lemma 3.15 *The morphism $\iota_{(p,q)}$ is well defined.*

Proof We have only to check that the second and the third correspondences are induced by the first correspondence as is checked. We have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^*(f_{\infty}^{(p,q)}) = \sigma^*\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{p+q}\cdot f_0^{(p,q)}\big) &= (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{p+q}\cdot\sigma^*(f_0^{(p,q)})\\ &\longmapsto (-1)^{p+q}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-p-q}\cdot(-\sqrt{-1})^{p+q}\cdot f_{\infty}^{(q,p)} = \overline{\sqrt{-1}}^{p+q}\cdot f_0^{(q,p)}\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

We also have the following:

$$\sigma^*(f_1^{(p,q)}) = \sigma^*\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{p}\cdot f_0^{(p,q)}\big) = (\sqrt{-1}\mu)^{p}\cdot\sigma^* f_0^{(p,q)} \longmapsto (-1)^{p}\cdot(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-p}\cdot\sqrt{-1}^{p+q}\cdot f_{\infty}^{(q,p)} = \sqrt{q-p}\cdot f_1^{(q,p)}.$$

Thus the morphism is well defined. ∎

Lemma 3.16 *The morphism* $\iota_{(p,q)}$ *is compatible with* $\phi_{(p,q),(p',q')}$, *i.e.,*

$$\iota_{(p',q')}\circ\sigma^*\big(\phi_{(p,q),(p',q')}\big) = \phi_{(p,q),(p',q')}\circ\iota_{(p',q')}.$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

Lemma 3.17 *We have the natural isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{O}(p_1,q_1)\otimes\mathcal{O}(p_2,q_2)\longmapsto\mathcal{O}(p_1+p_2,q_1+q_2).$$

It is given by $f_a^{(p_1,q_1)}\otimes f_a^{(p_2,q_2)}\longmapsto f_a^{(p_1+p_2,q_1+q_2)}$ *for* $a=0,1,\infty$.

It is compatible with the morphisms $\phi_{(p,q),(p',q')}$, $\rho_{(p,q)}$ *and* $\iota_{(p,q)}$. ∎

Lemma 3.18 *We have the isomorphism* $\mathcal{O}(-n,-n)\simeq\mathbb{T}(n)$ *given by* $f_a^{(-n,-n)}\longmapsto t_a^{(n)}$ *for* $a=0,1,\infty$. ∎

3.3.3 The description as the Rees bundle

We have the following description as the Rees bundle. We put $\boldsymbol{C}(p,q)=\boldsymbol{C}\cdot e^{(p,q)}$. The decreasing filtrations ${}_aF_{(p,q)}$ $(a=1,2)$ are defined as follows:

$${}_1F^i_{(p,q)}=\begin{cases}0 & (i>p)\\ \boldsymbol{C}(p,q) & (i\leq p)\end{cases}\qquad {}_2F^i_{(p,q)}=\begin{cases}0 & (i>q)\\ \boldsymbol{C}(p,q) & (i\leq q)\end{cases}$$

We have the Rees bundle $\xi\big(\boldsymbol{C}(p,q),{}_1F_{(p,q)},{}_2F_{(p,q)}\big)$. The correspondence $e^{(p,q)}\longmapsto f_1^{(p,q)}$ induces the equivariant isomorphism $\xi\big(\boldsymbol{C}(p,q),{}_1F_{(p,q)},{}_2F_{(p,q)}\big)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(p,q)$

We have the isomorphism $\boldsymbol{C}(p,q)^{\dagger}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}(q,p)$ given by $a\cdot\overline{e^{p,q}}\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{q-p}\cdot a\cdot e^{q,p}$. It induces the isomorphism $\iota_{(p,q)}:\sigma^*\mathcal{O}(p,q)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(q,p)$.

We have the pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{(p,q)}:\boldsymbol{C}(p,q)\otimes\boldsymbol{C}(p,q)^{\dagger}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}(n,n)$, which is given as follows:

$$e^{(p,q)}\otimes\overline{e^{(p,q)}}\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{q-p}\cdot e^{(n,n)}.$$

Since the real base of $\boldsymbol{C}(n,n)$ is given by $e^{(n,n)}$, the pairing $\sqrt{-1}^{p-q}\cdot\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{(p,q)}$ is positive definite. Note that the pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ corresponds to $S_{(p,q)}$ below.

3.3.4 Polarization of twistor structure

In the case $p+q=n$, the canonical pairing $S_{(p,q)}:\mathcal{O}(p,q)\otimes\sigma^*\mathcal{O}(p,q)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ is defined to be the composite of the morphisms $\mathcal{O}(p,q)\otimes\sigma^*\mathcal{O}(p,q)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(p,q)\otimes\mathcal{O}(q,p)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(p+q,p+q)=\mathbb{T}(-n)$. More precise correspondence is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&f_1^{(p,q)}\otimes\sigma^*(f_1^{(p,q)})\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{q-p}\cdot f_1^{(p,q)}\otimes f_1^{(q,p)}\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{q-p}\cdot t_1^{(-n)},\\ &f_0^{(p,q)}\otimes\sigma^*(f_{\infty}^{(p,q)})\longmapsto(-\sqrt{-1})^{n}\cdot f_0^{(p,q)}\otimes f_0^{q,p}\longmapsto(-\sqrt{-1})^{n}\cdot t_0^{(-n)},\\ &f_{\infty}^{(p,q)}\otimes\sigma^*(f_0^{(p,q)})\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{n}\cdot f_{\infty}^{(p,q)}\otimes f_{\infty}^{(q,p)}\longmapsto\sqrt{-1}^{n}\cdot t_{\infty}^{(-n)}.\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

Lemma 3.19 *Let consider the case $p+q=p'+q'=n$. Under the isomorphism $\mathcal{O}(p,q)\simeq\mathcal{O}(p',q')$ given by* (39)*, we have $S_{(p,q)}=S_{(p',q')}$.*

Proof It immediately follows from (41). ▮

When we forget the torus action, we use the notation $S_{(n)}$ instead of $S_{(p,q)}$.

Lemma 3.20 *The pairing $S_{(n)}$ is $(-1)^n$-symmetric.*

Proof We have $S_{(n)}\big(f_0^{(n)}\otimes\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)})\big)=(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot t_0^{(-n)}$ and $S_{(n)}\big(f_\infty^{(n)}\otimes\sigma(f_0^{(n)})\big)=(\sqrt{-1})^{n}t_\infty^{(-n)}$. Hence we have the following equalities:

$$\sigma\Big(S_{(n)}\big(f_\infty^{(n)}\otimes\sigma(f_0^{(n)})\big)\Big)=(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot(-1)^n\cdot t_0^{(-n)}=(-1)^n\cdot S_{(n)}\big(f_0^{(n)}\otimes\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)})\big).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Let V be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundle, and let $S:V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ be a pairing. Then the pairing $S_{(i)}$ induces the following pairing:

$$S:\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(i)\big)\otimes\sigma\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(i)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n+i).$$

Definition 3.9 (Simpson) *Let V be a pure twistor of weight n, and let $S:V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ is a pairing.*

- *In the case $n=0$, the pairing S is called a polarization if the induced hermitian pairing on $H^0(\mathbb{P}^1,V)$ is positive definite.*
- *For any n, the pairing S is called polarization if the induced pairing $S:\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)\big)\otimes\sigma\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$ is polarization of the pure twistor structure $V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)$ of weight 0.* ▮

3.3.5 The polarization of dual and the conjugate

The polarization $S:\mathcal{O}(n)\otimes\sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(n)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ and the isomorphism $\sigma(\mathbb{T}(-n))\simeq\mathbb{T}(-n)$ induce the pairing $\sigma(S):\sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(n)\big)\otimes\mathcal{O}(n)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$.

Lemma 3.21 *The pairing $\sigma(S)$ is a polarization.*

Proof The pairing $\sigma(S)$ is the composite of the following correspondences:

$$\sigma(f_0^{(n)})\otimes f_\infty^{(n)}\longmapsto\sigma\big((\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot t_0^{(-n)}\big)\longmapsto(\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot(-1)^n\cdot t_\infty^{(-n)}=(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot t_\infty^{(-n)},$$

$$\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)})\otimes f_0^{(n)}\longmapsto\sigma\big((\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot t_\infty^{(-n)}\big)\longmapsto(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot(-1)^n\cdot t_0^{(-n)}=(\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot t_0^{(-n)}.$$

Hence the pairing $\sigma(S)(-n)$ is given by the composite of the following correspondences:

$$\big(\sigma(f_0^{(n)})\otimes f_\infty^{(-n)}\big)\otimes\big(f_\infty\otimes\sigma(f_0^{(-n)})\big)\longmapsto(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot t_\infty^{(-n)}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^{-n}\cdot t_\infty^{(n)}=(-1)^n\cdot t_\infty^{(0)},$$

$$\big(\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)})\otimes f_0^{(-n)}\big)\otimes\big(f_0^{(n)}\otimes\sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)})\big)\longmapsto(\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot t_0^{(-n)}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^n\cdot t_0^{(n)}=(-1)^n\cdot t_\infty^{(0)}.$$

A global section s of $\sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(n)\big)\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)$ is given as follows:

$$s=\sigma\big(f_0^{(n)}\big)\otimes f_\infty^{(-n)}=\sigma\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-n}\cdot f_\infty^{(n)}\big)=(-1)^n\cdot\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)})\otimes f_0^{(-n)}.$$

Hence we obtain $\sigma(S)(-n)(s,\sigma(s))=1$, which means $\sigma(S)$ is a polarization. ▮

As for the dual, the induced pairing $S^\vee:\mathcal{O}(-n)\otimes\sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(-n)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(n)$ is clearly the polarization.

Lemma 3.22 *Let V be a pure twistor of weight n, and $S:V\otimes\sigma\big(V\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ is a polarization. Then the following induced pairings are also the polarization:*

$$\sigma(S):\sigma(V)\otimes V\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n),\qquad S^\vee:V^\vee\otimes\sigma(V^\vee)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(n).$$

Proof Since any polarized pure twistor of weight n is isomorphic to a direct sum of $\big(\mathcal{O}(n),S\big)$, the lemma can be reduced to the case $\big(\mathcal{O}(n),S\big)$. It has been already checked above. ▮

3.3.6 Some remarks

Let (H, F, G) be a bi-filtered vector bundle and we put $(V, \rho) = \xi(H, F, G)$. A pairing $S : (V, \rho) \otimes \sigma(V, \rho) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$ corresponds to the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : (H, F, G) \otimes (H^{\dagger}, G^{\dagger}, F^{\dagger}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}(n, n)$. The correspondence can be regarded as follows: S induces the morphism $C^{\infty}(X, H)[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}] \otimes C^{\infty}(X, H^{\dagger})[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}] \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}(n, n)[\lambda, \lambda^{-1}]$, and $H \otimes H^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}(n, n)$.

Lemma 3.23 *S is defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$ if and only if $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.* ▮

Lemma 3.24 *A morphism $V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ corresponds to a morphism $(H, F, G) \longrightarrow (H, F, G) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}(1, 1)$.*

Proof It follows from $\mathbb{T}(-1) = \xi(\boldsymbol{C}(1, 1))$ and the equivalence of the categories (Proposition 3.1). ▮

Let $f : (V, \rho) \longrightarrow (V, \rho) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$, which corresponds to $f_{|1} := f_{|\lambda=1} : (H, F, G) \longrightarrow (H, F, G) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}(1, 1)$.

Lemma 3.25 *$S(f \otimes \mathrm{id}) + S\bigl(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f)\bigr) = 0$ if and only if $\langle f_{|1} \otimes \mathrm{id} \rangle + \langle \mathrm{id} \otimes f_{|1} \rangle = 0$.* ▮

Recall that we have the isomorphism $\boldsymbol{C}(1, 1) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}(-1, -1) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}(0, 0)$, given by the following:

$$\bigl(t^{(-1)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}\bigr) \otimes \bigl(t^{(1)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}\bigr) \longmapsto t^{(0)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}.$$

The multiplication $t^{(1)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}$ gives the isomorphism of the vector spaces $\boldsymbol{C}(1, 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{C}(0, 0)$, which preserves the real bases. Under the isomorphism, we can identify the morphisms $\bigl(f \cdot t^{(1)}\bigr)_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}$ and $f_{|\lambda=1}$. We put $N := -(f \cdot t^{(1)})_{|\lambda=1}$.

Lemma 3.26 *Under the identification, we have the following identities:*

$$\bigl\langle f_{|1} \otimes \mathrm{id} \bigr\rangle + \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f)_{|1} \bigr\rangle = -\Bigl(\bigl\langle N \otimes \mathrm{id} \bigr\rangle + \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(N) \bigr\rangle\Bigr).$$

$$(-1)^{h} \cdot \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma\bigl(f^{h}\bigr)_{|\lambda=1} \bigr\rangle = \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(N^{h}) \bigr\rangle.$$

Proof We have the following:

$$\bigl\langle f_{|1} \otimes \mathrm{id} \bigr\rangle + \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f)_{|1} \bigr\rangle = -\bigl\langle \bigl(f \otimes t^{(1)}_{1}\bigr)_{|1} \otimes \mathrm{id} \bigr\rangle - \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f \otimes t^{(1)}_{1})_{|1} \bigr\rangle = -\bigl(\bigl\langle N \otimes \mathrm{id} \bigr\rangle + \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(N) \bigr\rangle\bigr).$$

We also have the following:

$$(-1)^{h} \cdot \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma\bigl(f\bigr)_{|\lambda=1} \bigr\rangle = \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma\bigl(\bigl(-f \cdot t^{(1)}_{1}\bigr)^{h}\bigr)_{|\lambda=1} \bigr\rangle = \bigl\langle \mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(N^{h}) \bigr\rangle.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

3.4 Equivalence of some categories

3.4.1 complex Hodge structure and the equivariant twistor structure

We put $(V, \rho) := \xi(H, F, G)$ for a bi-filtered vector bundle (H, F, G) bundle over a C^{∞}-manifold X.

Lemma 3.27 *V is pure twistor bundle of weight n if and only if (H, F, G) is complex Hodge structure bundle, i.e., F and G are n-opposed.*

Proof If F and G are n-opposed, then we have the decomposition $H = \bigoplus_{p+q=n} H^{p,q}$, where $H^{p,q} = F^{p} \cap G^{q}$. Then $\xi(H, F, G) \simeq \bigoplus_{p+q=n} H^{p,q} \otimes \mathcal{O}(p, q)$. Hence it is pure twistor of weight n.

We can assume X is a point. By considering $V \otimes \mathcal{O}(-n, 0)$, we can reduce the problem to the case $n = 0$. We have the weight decomposition

$$H^{0}(\mathbb{P}^{1}, V) = \bigoplus_{h} U_{h}.$$

Here U_h denotes the weight h-space. Then U_h gives the subbundle $U_h \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \subset V$, which is isomorphic to a direct sum of $\mathcal{O}(h, -h)$, and $(V, \rho) = \bigoplus_{h} U_h \otimes \mathcal{O}(h, -h)$. Then it can be checked that the corresponding filtrations F and G are n-opposed. ▮

Corollary 3.2 *The functor ξ gives the equivalence of the following two categories:*

- *The category of equivariant pure twistor bundle of weight n.*
- *The category of complex pure Hodge structure bundle of weight n.*

The functor ξ gives the equivalence of the following two categories:

- *The category of equivariant pure twistor bundle of weight n defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*
- *The category of real pure Hodge structure bundle of weight n.* ∎

Corollary 3.3 *The functor ξ gives the equivalence of the following two categories:*

- *The category of equivariant mixed twistor bundle.*
- *The category of complex mixed Hodge structure bundle.*

The functor ξ gives the equivalence of the following two categories:

- *The category of equivariant mixed twistor bundle defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*
- *The category of real mixed Hodge structure bundle.* ∎

Let $S : (V,\rho)\otimes\sigma(V,\rho) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$ be an equivariant pairing. Let $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : (H,F,G)\otimes(H^{\dagger},G^{\dagger},F^{\dagger}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}(n,n)$ be the corresponding pairing.

Lemma 3.28 *The pairing S is a polarization of twistor structure if and only if the induced pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is a polarization of Hodge structure.*

Proof We may assume that X is a point. We have the following:

$$\sigma^*S\bigl(a\cdot u\otimes\sigma^*(b\cdot v)\bigr)=\sigma^*\Bigl(a\cdot\overline{\sigma^*(b)}\cdot\langle u,v\rangle\Bigr)=\overline{\sigma^*(a)}\cdot b\cdot\overline{\langle u,v\rangle}.$$

We also have the following equality:

$$S\bigl(b\cdot v\otimes\sigma^*(a\cdot u)\bigr)=\overline{\sigma^*(a)}\cdot b\cdot\langle v,u\rangle.$$

Hence S is $(-1)^n$-symmetric if and only if $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is $(-1)^n$-hermitian symmetric.

To compare the positive definiteness conditions, note the following:

$$H^0\bigl(\mathbb{P}^1,V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)\bigr)=\bigoplus_{p+q=n}\bigl\{\lambda^{-p+n}\cdot u\,\big|\,u\in H^{p,q}\bigr\}.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}&S(-n)\Bigl(\lambda^{-p+n}\cdot u\otimes f_1^{(-n,0)}\otimes\sigma\bigl(\lambda^{-p+n}\cdot u\otimes f_1^{(-n,0)}\bigr)\Bigr)\\&\qquad=\langle u,u\rangle\cdot\lambda^{-p+n}\cdot(-\lambda)^{p-n}\cdot f_1^{(-n,0)}\otimes\bigl(\sqrt{-1}^{\,n}\cdot f_1^{(0,-n)}\bigr)=\langle u,u\rangle\cdot t_1^{(n)}\cdot\sqrt{-1}^{\,p-q}.\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

Here we have used the equality $(-1)^{p-n}\cdot\sqrt{-1}^{\,n}=\sqrt{-1}^{\,p-q}$. Thus $H^0(S(-n))$ is positive definite if and only if $\sqrt{-1}^{\,p-q}\cdot\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is positive definite. Note that the real base of $\boldsymbol{C}(n,n)$ is fixed as $t_1^{(-n)}$. ∎

Corollary 3.4 *The functor ξ gives an equivalence of the following categories:*

- *The category of the equivariant polarized pure twistor bundle of weight n.*
- *The category of polarized complex pure Hodge structure bundle of weight n.*

The functor ξ gives an equivalence of the following categories:

- *The category of the equivariant polarized pure twistor bundle of weight n defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*
- *The category of polarized real pure Hodge structure bundle of weight n.* ∎

3.4.2 Polarized mixed twistor structures

Definition 3.10 *A tuple (V, W, N, S) as follows is called a polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable:*

1. *(V, W) is a mixed twistor structure.*
2. *The morphism $f : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ is a morphism of mixed twistors, and it is nilpotent. The weight filtration of N is denoted by $W(f)$.*
3. *The pairing $S : V \otimes \sigma(V) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$ is a morphism of mixed twistor satisfying the following:*
$$S(f \otimes \mathrm{id}) + S(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f)) = 0.$$
Note that we obtain the induced morphism:
$$S : \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h+n} \otimes \mathrm{Gr}^W_{-h+n} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n).$$
4. *We have $W_h = W(f)_{h-n}$ for any h.*
5. *The induced pairing $S(f^h \otimes \mathrm{id}) = (-1)^h \cdot S\bigl(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f^h)\bigr)$ gives the polarization of the primitive part $P\,\mathrm{Gr}^W_{h+n} = \mathrm{Ker}\bigl(N^{h+1} : \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h+n} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W_{n-h-2}\bigr)$.*

If a tuple (V, W, f, S) satisfies the first four conditions, then it is called a pseudo-polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable. ∎

Assume (V, W, f, S) is a pseudo-polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable. We put as follows:
$$V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V), \quad W^{(0)}_h = \bigoplus_{i \leq h} \mathrm{Gr}^W_i(V).$$
We obtain the induced morphism $f^{(0)} : \mathrm{Gr}^W_i \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W_{i-2} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$, and $f^{(0)} : V^{(0)} \longrightarrow V^{(0)}$. We also obtain the induced morphism $S^{(0)} : V^{(0)} \otimes \sigma(V^{(0)}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$. Then it is easy to check that $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ is also a pseudo-polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable.

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 3.29 *Let (V, W, f, S) be a pseudo polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable. Then it is a polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable, if and only if the induced tuple $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ is a polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in one variable.* ∎

Definition 3.11 *A tuple $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is called polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in l variable, if*

- *(V, W) is a mixed twistor structure.*
- *$\boldsymbol{f}$ is a tuple of nilpotent morphisms $f_i : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ of mixed twistor structures.*
- *Let $S : V \otimes \sigma(V) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$ be a morphism of mixed twistor structures satisfying the following:*
$$S(f_i \otimes \mathrm{id}) + S\bigl(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(f_i)\bigr) = 0.$$
- *For any element $\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{C}^l$, we put $f(\boldsymbol{a}) := \sum a_i \cdot f_i$. Then $\bigl(V, W, f(\boldsymbol{a}), S\bigr)$ is a polarized mixed twistor structure in one variable of weight n for any element $\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l_{>0}$.*

For simplicity, polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in l-variable is abbreviated to Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type.

If a tuple $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ satisfies the first three conditions, then it is called pseudo polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in l-variable. Similarly, pseudo polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n in l-variable is abbreviated to Ψ-Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type. ∎

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is a Ψ-Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type. Then we put as follows:

$$V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V), \quad W_h^{(0)} := \bigoplus_{i \leq h} \mathrm{Gr}_i^W(V).$$

We have the induced morphism $f_j^{(0)} : \mathrm{Gr}_i^W(V) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{i-2}^W(V) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ and $f_j^{(0)} : V^{(0)} \longrightarrow V^{(0)} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$. We also have the induced morphism:

$$S^{(0)} : V^{(0)} \otimes \sigma(V^{(0)}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n),$$

$$S^{(0)} : \mathrm{Gr}_{i+n}^W(V) \otimes \sigma\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_{-i+n}^W(V)\bigr) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n).$$

Then it is easy to check that $\bigl(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{f}^{(0)}, S^{(0)}\bigr)$ is also a Ψ-Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type.

Lemma 3.30 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is a Ψ-Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type. It is a Pol-MTS of (n, l)-type, if and only if the induced tuple $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{f}^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ is a Pol-MTS of (n, l).*

Proof It follows from Lemma 3.29. ∎

Lemma 3.31 *The functor ξ gives the following categories:*

- *The category of polarized equivariant mixed twistor structures.*
- *The category of polarized mixed Hodge structures defined over $\boldsymbol{C}$.*

The functor ξ gives the following categories:

- *The category of equivariant mixed twistor structures defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*
- *The category of polarized mixed Hodge structures defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 3.25, Lemma 3.26 and Corollary 3.4. ∎

3.5 Variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles

3.5.1 Definition and some functorial properties

We put as follows:

$$\xi\Omega_X^1 := \Omega_X^{1,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1,0) \oplus \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(0,1), \qquad \xi\Omega_X^h := \bigwedge^h \bigl(\xi\Omega_X^1\bigr).$$

We have the differential operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}$ defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle} : C^\infty(X) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X, \xi\Omega_X^1), \quad g \longmapsto \partial_X(g) \otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)} + \overline{\partial}_X(g) \otimes \bigl(\sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(0,1)}\bigr).$$

When we forget the torus action, we can use the notation $f_x^{(1)}$ $(x = 0, 1, \infty)$ instead of $f_x^{(1,0)}$ or $f_x^{(0,1)}$. On the open subsets $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$ and $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$, it can be regarded as follows: On $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, we take the base $f_0^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1)_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$. Then $\mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle}$ induces the operator $(\overline{\partial}_X + \lambda \cdot \partial_X) \otimes (\sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(1)})$. On $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\mu$, we take the base $f_\infty^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1)_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}$. Then $\mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle}$ induces the operator $(\partial_X + \mu\overline{\partial}_X) \otimes f_\infty^{(1)}$. On $X \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$, we take the base of $f_\infty^{(1,0)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1,0)$ and $\sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(0,1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(0,1)$, and then $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}$ induces the operator $d_X = \overline{\partial}_X + \partial_X$.

The following lemma can be checked easily.

Lemma 3.32

1. *The Leibniz rule holds in the following sense:*

$$\mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle}(f \cdot g) = f \cdot \mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle}(g) + \mathbb{D}_X^{\triangle}(f) \cdot g.$$

2. We have the induced operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}$ on $C^{\infty}(X\times\mathbb{P}^1,\xi\Omega^{\cdot}_X)$, and we have the flatness $(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_X+\overline{\partial}_{\mathbb{P}^1})^2=0$. ∎

Let V be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

Definition 3.12 *A variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ is defined to be a differential operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V: C^{\infty}(X\times\mathbb{P}^1,V)\longrightarrow C^{\infty}\bigl(X\times\mathbb{P}^1,V\otimes\xi\Omega^1_X\bigr)$ satisfying the following conditions:*

$$\bigl(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V+d''_V\bigr)^2=0,\qquad \mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V(f\cdot v)=f\cdot\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V(v)+(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_X f)\cdot v.$$

∎

A tensor product, a direct sum and a dual for variations of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles are naturally defined. Let $(V^{(i)},\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{V^{(i)}})$ $(i=1,2)$ be variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles. A morphism of $(V^{(1)},\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{V^{(1)}})$ to $(V^{(2)},\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{V^{(2)}})$ is defined to be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic and $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$-flat section of $Hom(V^{(1)},V^{(2)})$.

3.5.2 Some description of a variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles

Let V be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle with variation $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$. On $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$, we take the base $f_0^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, and then $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$ induces the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}_V: C^{\infty}(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda},V_0)\longrightarrow C^{\infty}(X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda},V_0\otimes\Omega^1_X)$, and we have the flatness $(\mathbb{D}_{V_0}+d'')^2=0$. On $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}$, we take the base $f_{\infty}^{(1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, and then $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{V_{\infty}}$ induces the μ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}_{V_{\infty}}: C^{\infty}\bigl(X^{\dagger}\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu},V_{\infty}\bigr)\longrightarrow C^{\infty}\bigl(X^{\dagger}\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu},V_{\infty}\otimes\Omega^1_{X^{\dagger}}\bigr)$, and we have the flatness $(\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}_{V_{\infty}}+d'')^2=0$. On $X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$, we take the bases $f_{\infty}^{(1,0)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(1,0)$ and $f_0^{(0,1)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(0,1)$, and then $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}$ induces the family of holomorphic connections $\mathbb{D}^{f}_{V_1}: C^{\infty}\bigl(X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda},V_1\bigr)\longrightarrow C^{\infty}\bigl(X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda},V_1\otimes\Omega^1_X\bigr)$, and we have the flatness $(\mathbb{D}^{f}_{V_1}+d'')^2=0$.

On the other hand, we can consider a patched object $(V_0,V_{\infty},V_1;\alpha_0,\alpha_{\infty})$:

- V_0 is a $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$, which is equipped with the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}_{V_0}$ such that $(\mathbb{D}_{V_0}+d'')^2=0$.
- V_{∞} is a $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}$, which is equipped with the μ-connection $\mathbb{D}_{V_{\infty}}$ such that $(\mathbb{D}_{V_{\infty}}+d'')^2=0$.
- V_1 is a $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$, which is equipped with the holomorphic family of the flat connections $\mathbb{D}^{f}_{V_1}$.
- We have the induced families of flat connections $(V_{0\,|\,X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}},\mathbb{D}^{f}_{V_0})$, $(V_{\infty\,|\,X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}},\mathbb{D}^{\dagger f}_{V_{\infty}})$. Then α_a $(a=0,\infty)$ are isomorphisms $V_{a\,|\,X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}}\longrightarrow V_{1\,|\,X\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}}$, which are compatible with the $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$-holomorphic structure and the family of flat connections.

Once we are given such a patched object $(V_0,V_{\infty},V_1;\alpha_0,\alpha_{\infty})$, then we have the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle V by gluing.

Lemma 3.33 *We have the well defined differential operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$ given as follows:*

$$\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V(f)=\begin{cases}\mathbb{D}_{V_0}(f)\otimes\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}\bigr), & (\text{on } X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda})\\[2ex] \mathbb{D}^{\dagger}_{V_{\infty}}(f)\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}, & (\text{on } X\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}).\end{cases}$$

The operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$ gives a variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles.

Proof The well definedness follows from the compatibility of α_a $(a=0,\infty)$ with the flat connections. It is easy to see that $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_V$ gives a variation. ∎

Corollary 3.5 *The category of the patched objects above and the category of the variations of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles are equivalent, by the correspondence given above.* ∎

We can also consider patched objects $(V_0,V_{\infty};\psi)$:

- V_0 is a $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$-holomorphic vector bundle equipped with λ-connection D_{V_0}.
- V_∞ is a $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$-holomorphic vector bundle equipped with μ-connection $D^{\dagger}_{V_\infty}$.
- ψ is an isomorphism of the induced family of the flat bundles $V_{0\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\times X}$ and $V_{1\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\times X}$.

As before, the category of such patched objects and the category of variations of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles are naturally equivalent.

In the following, we often use the descriptions $\bigl(V_0, V_\infty, V_1; \alpha_0, \alpha_\infty\bigr)$ or (V_0, V_∞, ψ) to denote the variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles.

3.5.3 An example of variation of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle

Let V be a vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$, and $f_i : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ be nilpotent morphisms such that f_i and f_j are commutative.

We put $X := \boldsymbol{C}^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$, and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. We will construct the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ and the variation $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}$ over $X - D$.

We put $V_0 := V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ and $V_\infty := V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}$. We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{V}_0 := V_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}, \qquad \mathcal{V}_\infty := V_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger}.$$

From the morphism $f_i \in Hom(V, V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1))$, we obtain the morphism $f_i \in Hom(V_0, V_0 \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1))$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, and then we have the endomorphism $f_i \otimes t_0^{(1)} \in \mathrm{End}(V_0)$. Then the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{V}_0}$ is given. Namely, for any $v \in \Gamma(\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda, V_0)$ and $g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D})$, we put as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{V}_0}(g \cdot v) := \sum_{i=1}^{l} g \cdot f_i(v) \cdot t_0^{(1)} \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i} + \bigl(\lambda \cdot \partial_X(g) + \overline{\partial}_X(g)\bigr) \cdot v. \tag{43}$$

We also have the endomorphism $f_i \otimes t_\infty^{(1)} \in \mathrm{End}(V_\infty)$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$. The μ-connection $\mathbb{D}^\dagger_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}$ is given. Namely, for any $v^\dagger \in \Gamma(\boldsymbol{C}_\mu, V_\infty)$ and $g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{X}^\dagger - \mathcal{D}^\dagger)$, we put as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}^\dagger_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}(g \cdot v^\dagger) := \sum_{i=1}^{l} g \cdot f_i(v^\dagger) \cdot t_\infty^{(1)} \cdot \frac{d\bar{z}_i}{\bar{z}_i} + \bigl(\mu \cdot \overline{\partial}_X(g) + \partial_X(g)\bigr) \cdot v^\dagger. \tag{44}$$

We will give the isomorphism $\Psi : \mathcal{V}_{0|\mathcal{X}^\sharp-\mathcal{D}^\sharp} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\infty|\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\sharp}-\mathcal{D}^{\dagger\sharp}}$. Let $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ and P be a point of $X - D$. Let v be an element of $V_{|\lambda}$. It gives the elements $v_0 \in V_{0\,|\,\lambda}$ and $v_\infty \in V_{\infty\,|\,\mu}$. Then we naturally obtain the following elements:

$$v_{0\,|\,P} \in \mathcal{V}_{0|(\lambda,P)}, \qquad v^\dagger_{\infty\,|\,P} \in \mathcal{V}_{\infty|(\mu,P)}.$$

Then Ψ is defined as follows:

$$\Psi\Bigl(\exp\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda^{-1} \cdot \log|z_i(P)|^2 \cdot f_i \otimes t_0^{(1)}\Bigr) \cdot v_{0|(\lambda,P)}\Bigr) = v_{\infty|(\mu,P)}, \tag{45}$$

or equivalently,

$$\Psi(v_{0\,|\,P}) = \exp\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu^{-1} \cdot \log|z_i(P)|^2 \cdot f_i \otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\Bigr) \cdot v_{\infty\,|\,P}.$$

Here we have used the relation $\lambda^{-1} \cdot t_0^{(1)} = -\mu^{-1} \cdot t_\infty^{(1)}$.

Corresponding to $v \in V_{|\lambda}$, we have the flat sections of $\mathcal{V}_{0\,|\,\mathcal{X}^\lambda-\mathcal{D}^\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\infty\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\mu}-\mathcal{D}^{\dagger\mu}}$:

$$\tilde{s}_0 := \exp\Bigl(-\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log z_i \cdot f_i \otimes t_1^{(1)}\Bigr) \cdot v_0,$$

$$\tilde{s}_\infty := \exp\Bigl(\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \bar{z}_i \cdot f_i \otimes t_1^{(1)}\Bigr) \cdot v_\infty.$$

Lemma 3.34 *We have the relation* $\tilde{s}_0 = \tilde{s}_\infty$. *The gluing* Ψ *is characterized by this property.*

Proof It can be easily checked by a direct calculation. ∎

Lemma 3.35 Ψ *is compatible with* $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{V}_0}$ *and* $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}$.

Proof We put as follows:

$$\tilde{v} := \exp\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda^{-1} \cdot \log |z_i|^2 \cdot f_i \otimes t_0^{(1)}\Bigr) v_0.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}^f_{\mathcal{V}_0}(\tilde{v}) &= \sum \lambda^{-1} \cdot f_i(\tilde{v}) \otimes t_0^{(1)} \frac{dz_i}{z_i} - \sum \lambda^{-1} \left(\frac{dz_i}{z_i} + \frac{d\bar{z}_i}{\bar{z}_i}\right) \cdot f_i(\tilde{v}) \otimes t_0^{(1)} \\ &= -\sum \lambda^{-1} f_i(\tilde{v}) \otimes t_0^{(1)} \frac{d\bar{z}_i}{\bar{z}_i} = \mu^{-1} \sum f_i(\tilde{v}) \otimes t_\infty^{(1)} \frac{d\bar{z}_i}{\bar{z}_i}. \qquad (46)\end{aligned}$$

Hence it is compatible with the definition of $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger f}_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}$ given in (44). ∎

We put $N_i := -f_i \otimes t_1^{(1)}$.

Lemma 3.36 *The endomorphism* $\exp\bigl(2\pi \cdot N_i\bigr)$ *is the monodromy of the loop* $\{0 \leq t \leq 1\} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^{*\,n}$ *given by the following:*

$$t \longmapsto \bigl(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}t) \cdot z_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n\bigr).$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

Remark 3.3 *When we consider the monodromy in this paper, we usually use the loop with the inverse direction:*

$$t \longmapsto \bigl(z_1, \dots, \cdot z_{i-1}, \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}t) \cdot z_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n\bigr).$$

However, Cattani-Kaplan-Schmid use the loop given in Lemma 3.36. *The author apologize the inconvenience, and he hopes that there are no confusion.* ∎

3.5.4 The involution and the induced variation

We have the isomorphisms $\iota_{1,0} : \sigma\mathcal{O}(1,0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(0,1)$ and $\iota_{0,1} : \sigma\mathcal{O}(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1,0)$. We take the isomorphisms $\sigma\Omega_X^{1,0} \longrightarrow \Omega_X^{0,1}$ and $\sigma\Omega_X^{0,1} \longrightarrow \Omega_X^{1,0}$ given by the following:

$$dz_i \longmapsto -d\bar{z}_i, \qquad d\bar{z}_i \longmapsto dz_i.$$

Then we obtain the morphisms $\sigma^*\bigl(\Omega_X^{1,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}(1,0)\bigr) \simeq \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(0,1)$ and $\sigma^*\bigl(\Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(0,1)\bigr) \simeq \Omega_X^{1,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}(1,0)$. We denote them by φ_0.

Lemma 3.37 *We have the following equalities:*

$$\varphi_0\bigl(\sigma^*\bigl(dz_i \otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)}\bigr)\bigr) = d\bar{z}_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} f_0^{(0,1)}, \qquad \varphi_0\bigl(\sigma^*\bigl(d\bar{z}_i \otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)}\bigr)\bigr) = -dz_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} f_0^{(0,1)},$$

$$\varphi_0\bigl(\sigma^*\bigl(d\bar{z}_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(0,1)}\bigr)\bigr) = dz_i \otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)}, \quad \varphi_0\bigl(\sigma^*\bigl(dz_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(0,1)}\bigr)\bigr) = -d\bar{z}_i \otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)}.$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

The morphism φ_0 induces the following morphisms:

$$C^\infty\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(1,0)\bigr) \simeq C^\infty\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(0,1)\bigr),$$

$$C^\infty\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \Omega_X^{0,1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(0,1)\bigr) \simeq C^\infty\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \Omega_X^{1,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}(1,0)\bigr).$$

We denote them by φ.

Lemma 3.38 *We have the following:*

$$\varphi\big(g\cdot dz\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1,0)}\big)=\sigma^{*}(\bar{g})\cdot d\bar{z}\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_{0}^{(0,1)},\qquad \varphi\big(g\cdot d\bar{z}\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_{0}^{(0,1)}\big)=\sigma^{*}(\bar{g})\cdot dz\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1,0)}.$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

Recall that we put $\varphi(f):=\sigma^{*}(\overline{f})$ for a function f.

Lemma 3.39 *We have* $\varphi\circ\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}=\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}\circ\varphi$.

Proof We have the following:

$$\varphi\big(\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}f\big)=\varphi(\partial_{X}f\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}+\overline{\partial}_{X}f\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_{0}^{(1)}).$$

We have the following, by using Lemma 3.38:

$$\varphi\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}dz_i\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}\Big)=\varphi\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}\Big)\cdot d\bar{z}_i\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_{0}^{(1)}=\frac{\partial\varphi(f)}{\partial\bar{z}_i}\cdot d\bar{z}_i\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_{0}^{(1)}.$$

Similarly we have the following:

$$\varphi\Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial\bar{z}_i}\cdot d\bar{z}_i\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_{0}^{(1)}\Big)=\frac{\partial\varphi(f)}{\partial z_i}\cdot dz_i\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}.$$

It implies the commutativity $\varphi\circ\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}=\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}\circ\varphi$. ∎

Let V be a $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Let $\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}$ be a variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles on V. We have the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundle $\sigma(V)$. Then we have the operator $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}$ on $\sigma(V)$ defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}\big(\sigma(v)\big)=\varphi_{0}\circ\sigma\big(\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}v\big).$$

Lemma 3.40 $\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}$ *is a variation of* $\mathbb{P}^1$*-holomorphic vector bundles.*

Proof We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}\big(f\cdot\sigma(v)\big)&=\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}\big(\sigma\big(\varphi(f)\cdot v\big)\big)=\varphi_{0}\circ\sigma\big(\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}(\varphi(f)\cdot v)\big)\\&=\varphi_{0}\circ\sigma\Big(\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}(\varphi(f))\cdot v+\varphi(f)\cdot\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}(v)\Big)=\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}(f)\cdot\sigma(v)+f\cdot\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(V)}^{\triangle}(\sigma(v)).\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

Thus we are done. ∎

3.5.5 Equivariant variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 3.41 $\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}$ *is equivariant with respect to the torus action. We have* $\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}(\sigma^{*}g)=\sigma^{*}\big(\mathbb{D}_{X}^{\triangle}g\big)$. ∎

Let (V,ρ) be an equivariant $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle over $X\times\mathbb{P}^1$. Let $\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}$ be the variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundles. We put $H:=V_{|\{1\}\times X}$. Then we have the flat connection $\mathbb{D}_0:=\mathbb{D}_{V\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times X}^{\triangle}$. Since V is equivariant, we have the two filtrations F and G on H, such that $\xi(H,F,G)\simeq(V,\rho)$.

Lemma 3.42 $\mathbb{D}_{V}^{\triangle}$ *is equivariant, if and only if* $\mathbb{D}_0$ *satisfies the Griffiths transversality in the following sense:*

$$\mathbb{D}_0^{(0,1)}\Big(C^{\infty}(F^{p})\Big)\subset C^{\infty}(F^{p}\otimes\Omega_X^{0,1}),\qquad \mathbb{D}_0^{(1,0)}\Big(C^{\infty}(F^{p})\Big)\subset C^{\infty}(F^{p-1}\otimes\Omega_X^{1,0}),$$

$$\mathbb{D}_0^{(0,1)}\Big(C^{\infty}(G^{p})\Big)\subset C^{\infty}(G^{p-1}\otimes\Omega_X^{0,1}),\quad \mathbb{D}_0^{(1,0)}\Big(C^{\infty}(G^{p})\Big)\subset C^{\infty}(G^{p}\otimes\Omega_X^{1,0}).$$

Proof Let s be a section of F^p. Then $\lambda^{-p}\cdot s$ is a section of V on $X\times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}_V^{\triangle}(\lambda^{-p}\cdot s)=\lambda^{-p}\cdot\big(\mathbb{D}^{(1,0)}s\otimes f_\infty^{(1,0)}+\mathbb{D}^{(0,1)}s\otimes f_0^{(0,1)}\big)=\lambda^{-p+1}\cdot\mathbb{D}_0^{(1,0)}(s)\otimes f_0^{(1,0)}+\lambda^{-p}\cdot\mathbb{D}_0^{(0,1)}(s)\otimes f_0^{(0,1)}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{D}_V^{\triangle}(\lambda^{-p}\cdot s)$ is a section of $V\otimes\xi\Omega_X^1$ on $X\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ if and only if the following is satisfied:

$$\mathbb{D}_0^{(1,0)}(s)\in F^{p-1}\otimes\Omega_X^{1,0},\qquad \mathbb{D}_0^{(0,1)}(s)\in F^p\otimes\Omega_X^{0,1}.$$

Similar things for G hold. Thus we are done. ▮

Let (W,ρ) be an equivariant subbundle of (V,ρ). We have the corresponding vector bundle H_W and H_V.

Lemma 3.43 *We have* $\mathbb{D}_V^{\triangle}\big(C^\infty(X,W)\big)\subset C^\infty(X,W\otimes\xi\Omega_X^1)$ *if and only if* H_W *is a flat vector subbundle of* H *with respect to the flat connection* $\mathbb{D}_0$.

Proof $\mathbb{D}_V$ induces the morphism $C^\infty(X,H)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]\longrightarrow C^\infty(X,H\otimes\Omega_X^1)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]$, which is same as $\mathbb{D}_0\otimes\mathrm{id}$. The both claims are equivalent to the following:

$$\mathbb{D}_V\Big(C^\infty(X,H_W)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]\Big)\subset C^\infty(X,H_W\otimes\Omega_X^1)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}].$$

Then the lemma follows. ▮

Let f be an equivariant morphism $(V_1,\rho_1)\longrightarrow(V_2,\rho_2)$ corresponding to $f_{|1}:(H_1,F_1,G_1)\longrightarrow(H_2,F_2,G_2)$.

Lemma 3.44 $\mathbb{D}_{V_2}^{\triangle}\circ f=f\circ\mathbb{D}_{V_1}^{\triangle}$ *if and only if* $\mathbb{D}_{0\,H_2}\circ f_{|1}=f_{|1}\circ\mathbb{D}_{0\,H_1}$.

Proof f induces the morphism $\tilde{f}:C^\infty(X,H_1)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]\longrightarrow C^\infty(X,H_2)[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}]$. Then the both claims are equivalent to the compatibility of $\tilde{f}$, $\mathbb{D}_{V_2}^{\triangle}$ and $\mathbb{D}_{V_1}^{\triangle}$. ▮

Corollary 3.6

- ι_V *is flat with respect to* $\mathbb{D}_V^{\triangle}$ *if and only if* ι_H *is flat with respect to* $\mathbb{D}_0$.
- S *is flat if and only if* $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ *is flat.*

Proof It follows from the previous lemma. ▮

Corollary 3.7 ξ *gives the equivalence of the following categories:*

- *The category of variation of pure twistor structures.*
- *The category of variation of complex pure Hodge structure.*

It is compatible with real structures and polarizations. ▮

Corollary 3.8 ξ *gives the equivalence of the following categories:*

- *The category of variation of mixed twistor structures.*
- *The category of variation of complex mixed Hodge structure.*

It is compatible with the real structures and the polarizations. ▮

3.6 The twistor nilpotent orbit

3.6.1 Pairing

We put $X=\boldsymbol{C}^n$, $D_i:=\bigl\{z_i=0\bigr\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. Let V be a holomorphic vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{f}$ be a tuple of nilpotent maps $f_i: V\longrightarrow V\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i=1,\ldots,n)$. From $(V,\boldsymbol{f})$, we obtain the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ and the variation $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}$ over $\mathbb{P}^1\times(X-D)$ (the subsubsection 3.5.3).

Let $S: V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$ be a pairing such that $S(f_i\otimes\mathrm{id})+S\bigl(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma(f_i)\bigr)=0$. Then the pairing $\tilde{S}:\mathcal{V}_0\otimes\sigma\mathcal{V}_\infty\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$ is given. Namely, for any $u\in V_0$, $v\in V_\infty$, $a\in C^\infty(\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D})$ and $b\in C^\infty(\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger)$, we put as follows:

$$\tilde{S}\bigl(a\cdot u\otimes\sigma(b\cdot v)\bigr)=a\cdot\overline{\sigma^*(b)}\cdot S\bigl(u\otimes\sigma(v)\bigr).$$

Then we obtain the morphism $\tilde{S}:\mathcal{V}(V,\boldsymbol{f})_0\otimes\sigma\mathcal{V}(V,\boldsymbol{f})_\infty\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Lemma 3.45 *$\tilde{S}$ is a morphism of λ-connections.*

Proof Let u and v be sections of V_0 and $\sigma(V_\infty)$ respectively. We have $\mathbb{D}_X\tilde{S}\bigl(u,\sigma^*(v)\bigr)=0$. On the other hand, we have the following equality on $\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}$:

$$\tilde{S}\bigl(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}u\otimes\sigma(v)\bigr)=\sum_i S\bigl(f_i(u)\otimes t_0^{(1)}\otimes v\bigr)\cdot\frac{dz_i}{z_i}\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1,0)}$$

We also have the following:

$$\begin{gathered}\tilde{S}\bigl(u\otimes\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}\sigma(v)\bigr)=\sum_i\tilde{S}\Bigl(u\otimes\varphi_0\sigma\Bigl(f_i(v)\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\otimes f_\infty^{(0,1)}\cdot\frac{d\overline{z}_i}{\overline{z}_i}\Bigr)\Bigr)\\ =\sum_i\tilde{S}\Bigl(u\otimes\varphi_0\sigma\bigl(f_i(v)\bigr)\Bigr)\otimes(-t_0^{(1)})\otimes(-\sqrt{-1})\cdot f_0^{(1,0)}\cdot\frac{dz_i}{z_i}=\sum_i S\Bigl(u\otimes\sigma\bigl(f_i(v)\bigr)\Bigr)\cdot t_0^{(1)}\cdot\frac{dz_i}{z_i}\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1,0)}.\end{gathered}\tag{48}$$

Thus we obtain the equality $\tilde{S}(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{V}_0}\otimes\mathrm{id})+\tilde{S}(\mathrm{id}\otimes\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(\mathcal{V}_\infty)})=\mathbb{D}_X\circ\tilde{S}$. ∎

On the plane $\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger$, we have the pairing $\tilde{S}:\mathcal{V}_\infty\otimes\sigma\mathcal{V}_0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger}$.

Lemma 3.46 *$\tilde{S}$ is a morphism of μ-connections.*

Proof Note the following equality on $\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger$:

$$\tilde{S}\bigl(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}u\otimes\sigma(v)\bigr)=\sum_i S\bigl(f_i(u)\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\otimes\sigma(v)\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(0,1)}\cdot\frac{d\overline{z}_i}{\overline{z}_i}$$

We also have the following:

$$\begin{gathered}\tilde{S}\bigl(u\otimes\mathbb{D}^\dagger_{\sigma(\mathcal{V}_0)}\sigma(v)\bigr)=\sum_i S\Bigl(u\otimes\varphi_0\sigma\Bigl(f_i(v)\otimes t_0^{(1)}\cdot\sqrt{-1}f_0^{(1,0)}\cdot\frac{dz_i}{z_i}\Bigr)\Bigr)\\ =\sum_i S\bigl(u\otimes\sigma\bigl(f_i(v)\bigr)\bigr)\otimes\bigl(-t_\infty^{(1)}\bigr)\cdot f_\infty^{(0,1)}\cdot(-\sqrt{-1})\cdot(\sqrt{-1}f_\infty^{(0,1)})\cdot\Bigl(-\frac{d\overline{z}_i}{\overline{z}_i}\Bigr)=\sum_i S\bigl(u\otimes\sigma\bigl(f_i(v)\bigr)\bigr)\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\cdot f_\infty^{(0,1)}\cdot\frac{d\overline{z}_i}{\overline{z}_i}.\end{gathered}\tag{49}$$

Thus we obtain the equality $\tilde{S}\bigl(\mathbb{D}^\dagger_{\mathcal{V}_\infty}(u)\otimes v\bigr)+\tilde{S}\bigl(u\otimes\mathbb{D}_{\sigma(\mathcal{V}_0)}\sigma(v)\bigr)=0$ for any $u,v\in\Gamma(\boldsymbol{C}_\mu,V_\infty)$. ∎

Lemma 3.47 *We obtain the pairing $S_{\mathcal{V}}:\mathcal{V}\otimes\sigma\mathcal{V}\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$.*

Proof We have only to check the pairings on the planes $\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{X}^\dagger-\mathcal{D}^\dagger$ are preserved by the gluing morphism. Note we have the following:

$$S\Big(\big(-\lambda^{-1}\cdot f_i\otimes t_0^{(1)}\big)\otimes\mathrm{id}\Big)+S\Big(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma\big(-\mu^{-1}\cdot f_i\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\big)\Big)=0.$$

Then we obtain the following compatibility.

$$S(u\otimes\sigma^*v)=S\Big(\exp\Big(-\sum\lambda^{-1}\cdot\log|z_i|^2f_i\otimes t_0^{(1)}\Big)u\otimes\sigma^*\exp\Big(-\sum\mu^{-1}\cdot\log|z_i|^2f_i\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\Big)v\Big).$$

Thus we are done. $\blacksquare$

3.6.2 Definition of twistor nilpotent orbit

Definition 3.13 *$(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$ is called a twistor nilpotent orbit, if there exists a positive constant $C>0$ such that $\big(\mathcal{V},\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}},S_{\mathcal{V}}\big)$ is a variation of polarized pure twistor structure over $\Delta(C)^{*\,n}$.* $\blacksquare$

Lemma 3.48 *The resulted harmonic bundle over $\Delta(C)^{*\,n}$ is tame. The eigenvalues of the residues of Higgs field are trivial. The parabolic structure is trivial.*

Proof The first two claims are clear from our construction of the variation. By our construction, it is clear that the eigenvalue is trivial. By seeing the eigenvalues of λ-connections for any λ, we obtain the triviality of the parabolic structures. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 3.49 *The tuple $\big(S^{\mathrm{can}}(Pat(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)),\mathrm{Res}_i,S\big)$ is isomorphic to the original $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$. (See the subsubsection 11.3.4.)*

Proof We have only to note that the prolongment of $M(V,\boldsymbol{f})$ is $V_0\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$. On $X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$, it is clear. Then by using the Hartogs Theorem, we obtain the coincidence ${}^\diamond M(V,\mathcal{F})=V_0\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Similarly, we obtain ${}^\diamond A(V,\mathcal{F})=V_\infty\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^\dagger}$. Then we obtain the isomorphisms:

$$S^{\mathrm{can}}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}\simeq V_0,\qquad S^{\mathrm{can}}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\simeq V_\infty.$$

Let us compare the gluing. Let λ be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. Let v be an element of $V_{|\lambda}$. Let us consider the multi-valued flat section $\tilde{v}_1$ of $M(V,\boldsymbol{f})_{|\lambda}$ and the multi-valued flat section $\tilde{v}_2$ of $A(V,\boldsymbol{f})_{|\lambda^{-1}}$ are given as follows:

$$\tilde{v}_1:=\exp\Big(-\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log z_i\cdot f_i\otimes t_1^{(1)}\Big)v,\quad \tilde{v}_2:=\exp\Big(\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\overline{z}_i\cdot f_i\otimes t_1^{(1)}\Big)v.$$

Then $\tilde{v}_1$ gives a flat section of $V_{0\,|\,\lambda}$, and $\tilde{v}_2$ gives a flat section of $V_{\infty\,|\,\lambda^{-1}}$. Then the gluing of S^{can} is obtained by the following relations:

$$\tilde{v}_1=\tilde{v}_2,\quad \tilde{v}_1\longmapsto v\in V_{0\,|\,\lambda},\quad \tilde{v}_2\longmapsto v\in V_{\infty\,|\,\lambda^{-1}}.$$

Here recall Φ^{can} is obtained by taking the degree 0-part of the polynomials $\sum v_J\cdot(\log z)^J$, which gives the second correspondence. The third correspondence can be obtained similarly. Hence the gluing of S^{can} is same as the gluing of V.

The comparison of f_i and Res_i and the comparison of the pairings should be checked only on $\mathcal{X}$, and it is easy. $\blacksquare$

3.6.3 A lemma for the restriction of twistor nilpotent orbit

We put $X=\boldsymbol{C}^l$ and $D=\bigcup_i D_i$. Let $\pi:X\longrightarrow D_{\underline{m}}$ denote the projection $(z_1,\ldots,z_l)\longmapsto(z_{m+1},\ldots,z_l)$. For any point $Q\in D^\circ_{\underline{m}}$, $\pi^{-1}(Q)$ is naturally isomorphic to Δ^m.

From $(V,\boldsymbol{f})$, we obtain the variation $(\mathcal{V},\mathbb{D})$ of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles over $X-D$. Let us consider the restriction $\mathcal{V}_{|\pi^{-1}(Q)}$.

We put $\tilde{Q} = (\overbrace{1,\ldots,}^{m} Q) \in X - D$. We put $V' := \mathcal{V}_{|\{\tilde{Q}\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}$. The vector bundle V' is a twist of V by the following endomorphism of $V_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}$:

$$\exp\Bigl(-\sum_{i=m+1}^{l} f_i \cdot \log|z_i(Q)|^2 \cdot t_1^{(1)}\Bigr).$$

The tuple $\boldsymbol{f}'$ of the morphisms $f_i' : V' \longrightarrow V' \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i = 1,\ldots,m)$ are naturally defined. Then it is easy to see that we have the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{V}(V',\boldsymbol{f}') \simeq \mathcal{V}(V,\boldsymbol{f})_{|\pi^{-1}(Q)}.$$

Thus we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.50 *Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a harmonic bundle over $\Delta^{*\,l}$ corresponding a twistor nilpotent orbit. Then the restriction $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{|\pi^{-1}(Q)}$ is also a harmonic bundle corresponding to a twistor nilpotent orbit.* ∎

3.6.4 Twist of Rees bundles

We would like to see the relation of twistor nilpotent orbit and the nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory.

Let H be a vector space with a decreasing filtration $F = (F^p)$. For an endomorphism g of H, we put $g \cdot F := (g \cdot F^p)$, which is called the twist of F by g. Then we obtain the left $Aut(H)$-action on the set of filtrations of H.

We have the natural isomorphism $i_F : \xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \simeq p_1^* H$. For an element $g \in Aut(H)$, we have the natural isomorphism $g : (H,F) \longrightarrow (H, g\cdot F)$. Then it induces the isomorphism $\phi_g : \xi(H,F) \longrightarrow \xi(H,g\cdot F)$.

Let $Aut_{eq}(p_1^*H)$ be equivariant automorphisms of p_1^*H. Clearly we have the natural isomorphism $Aut_{eq}(p_1^*H) \simeq Aut(H)$. We do not distinguish them.

Let g be an element of $Aut(H)$. Then we have the twist of i_F, i.e., $g\circ i_F : \xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \simeq p_1^*(H)$. Then we have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "g\circ i_F"] \arrow[d, "\phi_g"'] & p_1^*H \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}"'] \\
\xi(H,g\cdot F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "i_F"] & p_1^*H.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let (H,F,G) be bi-filtered vector bundle. The Rees bundle $\xi(H,F,G)$ is obtained by the following gluing:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "i_F"] & p_1^*H & \xi(H,G)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu} \arrow[l, "i_G"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let g_i $(i = 1,2)$ be element of $Aut(H)$. Then the vector bundle $\xi(H,F,G,g_1,g_2)$, is obtained as the twisting $\xi(H,F,G)$ by g_i:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "g_1\circ i_F"] & p_1^*H & \xi(H,G)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu} \arrow[l, "g_2\circ i_G"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Lemma 3.51 *$\xi(H,F,G,g_1,g_2)$ is naturally isomorphic to $\xi(H,g_1\cdot F,g_2\cdot G)$.*

Proof We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\xi(H,F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "g_1\circ i_F"] \arrow[d, "\phi_{g_1}"'] & p_1^*H \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}"'] & \xi(H,G)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu} \arrow[l, "g_2\circ i_G"'] \arrow[d, "\phi_{g_2}"'] \\
\xi(H,g_1\cdot F)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \arrow[r, "i_F"] & p_1^*H & \xi(H,g_2\cdot G)_{|X\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu} \arrow[l, "i_G"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

It gives the isomorphism desired. ∎

3.6.5 The induced variation from an equivariant nilpotent tuple

We put $X=\boldsymbol{C}^n$, $D_i=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. We put $\tilde{X}=\boldsymbol{C}^n$, and then we have the universal covering $\pi:\tilde{X}\longrightarrow X-D$, given by the correspondence $\zeta_i\longmapsto\exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}\zeta_i\bigr)$.

From $(V,\boldsymbol{f})$, we obtain the $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ and the variation $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}$ over $\mathbb{P}^1\times(X-D)$ (the subsubsection 3.5.3).

Lemma 3.52 *If $(V,\boldsymbol{f})$ is equivariant, then the vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ and the variation $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}$ are naturally equivariant.*

Proof Since $-\sqrt{-1}f_i\otimes t_1^{(1)}$ is equivariant, the gluing (45) is equivariant. Thus we have the natural torus action on $\mathcal{V}$. The following sections, appearing in (43) and (44), are invariant with respect to the torus action:

$$f_i\otimes t_0^{(1)}\otimes\frac{dz_i}{z_i}\cdot f_0^{(1,0)},\quad f_i\otimes t_\infty^{(1)}\otimes\frac{d\overline{z}_i}{\overline{z}_i}\cdot f_\infty^{(0,1)}.$$

Hence $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is also equivariant. ∎

We put $\mathcal{H}:=\mathcal{V}_{|\{1\}\times(X-D)}$. Then we obtain the two filtrations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\xi(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G})\simeq\mathcal{V}$. We also have the flat connection $\mathbb{D}_0$ on $\mathcal{H}$.

On $P_0:=\overbrace{(1,\ldots,1)}^{n}\in X-D$, the fiber $\mathcal{V}_{|\mathbb{P}^1\times\{P_0\}}$ is naturally identified with V, and $\mathcal{H}_{|(1,P_0)}\simeq H$.

Let us consider $\pi^*\mathcal{H}$. We have the flat connection $\pi^*\mathbb{D}_0$ and the isomorphism $\pi^*\mathcal{H}_{|O}\simeq H$. They induce the isomorphism $\pi^*\mathcal{H}\simeq p^*H$, where p denotes the natural morphism $\boldsymbol{C}^n\longrightarrow\{1\}\subset\mathbb{P}^1$. We have the two filtrations $\pi^*\mathcal{F}$ and p^*F. We also have $\pi^*\mathcal{G}$ and p^*G.

We put $N_i:=-(f_i\otimes t_1^{(1)})_{|\lambda=1}$. Recall Lemma 3.36 and Remark 3.3.

Lemma 3.53 *The following equalities of filtrations hold:*

$$\pi^*\mathcal{F}=\exp\Bigl(\sum\zeta_iN_i\Bigr)\cdot p^*F,\qquad\pi^*\mathcal{G}=\exp\Bigl(\sum\overline{\zeta}_iN_i\Bigr)\cdot p^*G.$$

Proof We put as follows:

$$g_0:=\exp\bigl(\sum_i\zeta_i\cdot N_i\bigr),\quad g_\infty:=\exp\bigl(\sum_i\bar{\zeta}_i\cdot N_i\bigr).$$

Let v be an element of $H\simeq\mathcal{V}_{|(O,\lambda)}$. We put $\tilde{v}_0:=g_0\cdot v$. Then it is the flat section of $\pi^*\mathcal{V}_{0\,|\,\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ such that $\tilde{v}_{0|(O,\lambda)}=v$.

We put $\tilde{v}_\infty:=g_\infty\cdot v$. Then it is the flat section of $\pi^*\mathcal{V}_{\infty\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\lambda}}$ such that $\tilde{v}_{2\,|\,(O,\lambda)}=v$.

The construction of the vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ is given by the relation $\tilde{v}_0=\tilde{v}_\infty$, due to Lemma 3.34. Hence the vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$ is given by the following gluing:

$$\xi\bigl(p^*H,p^*F\bigr)_{\tilde{X}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}\xrightarrow{g_0^{-1}\circ i_F}p_1^*H\xleftarrow{g_\infty^{-1}\circ i_G}\xi\bigl(p^*H,p^*G\bigr)_{\tilde{X}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}.$$

Here p_1 denote the canonical morphism of $\tilde{X}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ to a point. Then we obtain the following equality, due to Lemma 3.51

$$\xi\bigl(\pi^*\mathcal{H},\pi^*\mathcal{F},\pi^*\mathcal{F}\bigr)\simeq\xi\Bigl(p^*H,\ g_0\cdot p^*F,\ g_\infty\cdot p^*G\Bigr).$$

Thus we are done. ∎

3.6.6 Reword

Let (H,F,G) be a bi-filtered vector space, and $N_i:(H,F,G)\longrightarrow(H,F,G)\otimes\boldsymbol{C}(1,1)$ be a morphism. We put $V=\xi(H,F,G)$, and then we have $f_i:V\longrightarrow V\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$.

We have the trivial local system p^*H on $\boldsymbol{C}^n$. Then we obtain the C^∞-bundle $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ with the natural flat connection $\mathbb{D}^{(1)}$. We have the $\mathbb{Z}^n$-action on $\boldsymbol{C}^n$ by $\boldsymbol{\zeta}\longmapsto\boldsymbol{\zeta}+\boldsymbol{n}\cdot2\pi\sqrt{-1}$. We lift it to the action on $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ as follows:

$$(\boldsymbol{\zeta},v)\longmapsto\Bigl(\boldsymbol{\zeta}+2\pi\cdot\boldsymbol{n},\ \prod\exp\bigl(2\pi\cdot n_i\cdot N_i\bigr)\cdot v\Bigr).$$

Here we regard N_i as the endomorphism of H by using the isomorphism of $\boldsymbol{C}(1,1) \simeq \boldsymbol{C}(0,0)$ given by $t^{(-1)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1} \longmapsto t^{(0)}_{1\,|\,\lambda=1}$. We have two filtrations on $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$:

$$\exp\Bigl(\sum_i \zeta_i \cdot N_i\Bigr) \cdot p^* F, \qquad \exp\Bigl(\sum \overline{\zeta}_i \cdot N_i\Bigr) \cdot p^* G.$$

We obtain the C^∞-bundle $\mathcal{H}$ with the flat connection on $\boldsymbol{C}^{*\,n}$, and the filtrations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. They satisfy the Griffiths transversality, and $\xi(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \simeq Pat(V, \boldsymbol{f})$.

Let $(H, F, \overline{F})$ be a bi-filtered vector space defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$. We put $V := \xi(H, F, \overline{F})$. Let $N_i : (H, F, \overline{F}) \longrightarrow (H, F, \overline{F}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}(1,1)$ be morphisms. The morphisms N_i induce the morphisms from $V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$, which we also denote by N_i. We put $f_i := -N_i$. Then we obtain the tuple of endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{f} = (f_i)$.

Corollary 3.9 *We have the isomorphism* $\xi(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{F}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}) \simeq \mathcal{V}(V, \boldsymbol{f})$.

Proof This is a reformulation of Lemma 3.53. ▮

Proposition 3.2 *The functor ξ gives an equivalence of the following categories:*

- *The equivariant twistor nilpotent orbit defined over $\boldsymbol{R}$.*
- *The nilpotent orbit in the category of Hodge theory in the sense of Schmid (Definition 1.14 in [8], for example).*

Proof It follows from the various equivalences (Corollary 3.7 and Corollary 3.9). ▮

3.7 Split polarized mixed twistor structure and the nilpotent orbit

3.7.1 Definition

Definition 3.14 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type (n, l). Assume that the grading $V = \bigoplus V_h$ is given, such that the following holds:*

- *V_h is pure twistor of weight h.*
- *$W_h = \bigoplus_{i \leq h} V_i$.*
- *f_j preserves the grading.*
- *The restriction of S to $V_i \otimes V_j$ is 0 unless $i + j = n$.*

In that case, $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is called a split Pol-MTS of type (n, l).

If $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is a Ψ-Pol-MTS of type (n, l), and if the grading satisfying the above conditions is given, then $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ is called a split Ψ-Pol-MTS of type (n, l) ▮

3.7.2 Preliminary on the split Pol-MTS in one variable of rank 2

We put $V^{[2]} := \mathcal{O}(1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-1)$. We have the filtration given by $W_{-1} = \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \subset W_1 = V^{[2]}$. Then $(V^{[2]}, W)$ is a mixed twistor structure.

Let $F^{[2]} : V^{[2]} \longrightarrow V^{[2]} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ be the morphism given by $f_x^{(1,0)} \longmapsto f_x^{(0,-1)} \otimes t_x^{(-1)}$ and $f_x^{(0,-1)} \longmapsto 0$ for $x = 0, 1, \infty$. We put $N = F^{[2]} \otimes t_1^{(1)}$.

We put $V_0^{[2]} := V^{[2]}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ and $V_\infty^{[2]} := V^{[2]}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}$. We have the frames $\bigl(f_0^{(1,0)}, f_0^{(0,-1)}\bigr)$ and $\bigl(f_\infty^{(1,0)}, f_\infty^{(0,-1)}\bigr)$ of $V_0^{[2]}$ and $V_\infty^{[2]}$ respectively. We have the frame $\bigl(f_1^{(1,0)}, f_1^{(0,-1)}\bigr)$ of $V^{[2]}_{0\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} = V^{[2]}_{\infty\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}$. We use the notation $f_1^{(1,0)\,\dagger}$ and $f_1^{(0,-1)\,\dagger}$, when we consider them as the frame of $V^{[2]}_{\infty\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu *}}$.

We twist the gluing as follows: Let λ be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. Let v be an element of $V^{[2]}_{|\lambda}$. It induces the element of $v \in V^{[2]}_{0\,|\,\lambda}$ and $v^\dagger \in V^{[2]}_{\infty\,|\,\mu}$, where we put $\mu = \lambda^{-1}$. The original gluing is given by $v = v^\dagger$. The twisted gluing is given by the following relation:

$$\exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}y \cdot N\bigr) v = v^\dagger.$$

Note that $y \cdot N$ gives the following correspondence:

$$f_1^{(1,0)} \longmapsto y \cdot f_1^{(0,-1)}, \qquad f_1^{(0,-1)} \longmapsto 0.$$

Thus the gluing is given by the following:

$$\big(f_1^{(1,0)}, f_1^{(0,-1)}\big) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \sqrt{-1}y & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \big(f_1^{(1,0)\,\dagger}, f_1^{(0,-1)\,\dagger}\big).$$

Then we obtain the following relation:

$$\big(f_0^{(1,0)}, f_0^{(0,-1)}\big) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{-1}\lambda & 0 \\ \sqrt{-1}y & -\sqrt{-1}\mu \end{pmatrix} = \big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}, f_\infty^{(0,-1)}\big).$$

Let $\tilde{V}_y^{[2]}$ denote the resulted vector bundle.

Lemma 3.54 *Assume that $y > 0$. The vector bundle $\tilde{V}_y^{[2]}$ is a pure twistor of weight 0 of rank 2. The tuple of global sections $(\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2)$, which are given as follows, is a base of the space of the global sections:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}_1 &:= \sqrt{-1}\lambda \cdot f_0^{(1,0)} + \sqrt{-1}y \cdot f_0^{(0,-1)} = f_\infty^{(1,0)}, \\ \tilde{s}_2 &:= f_0^{(1,0)} = -\sqrt{-1}\mu \cdot f_\infty^{(1,0)} - \sqrt{-1}y \cdot f_\infty^{(0,-1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Proof It can be checked by direct calculations. ▮

The pairing $\eta_1 : \mathcal{O}(1,0) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(0,-1)\big) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$ is given as the composite of the following naturally defined morphisms:

$$\mathcal{O}(1,0) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(0,-1)\big) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1,0) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1,0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0).$$

The pairing $\eta_2 : \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(1,0)\big) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$ is given similarly.

Let us consider the pairing $S^{[2]} : V^{[2]} \otimes V^{[2]} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$ given as follows: The restriction of $S^{[2]}$ to $\mathcal{O}(1,0) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(1,0)\big) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(0,-1)\big)$ is defined to be trivial. The restriction of $S^{[2]}$ to $\mathcal{O}(1,0) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(0,-1)\big)$ is defined to be $-\eta_1$. The restriction of $S^{[2]}$ to $\mathcal{O}(0,-1) \otimes \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(1,0)\big)$ is defined to be η_2.

Lemma 3.55 *We have $S^{[2]}\big(f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)}\big)\big) = -\sqrt{-1}t_0^{(0)}$ and $S^{[2]}\big(f_0^{(0,-1)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = -\sqrt{-1}t_0^{(0)}$.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ▮

Lemma 3.56

- *The pairing $S^{[2]}$ is symmetric.*
- *We have the relation $S^{[2]}\big(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(F^{[2]})\big) + S^{[2]}\big(F^{[2]} \otimes \mathrm{id}\big)$.*
- *The induced pairing $-S^{[2]}(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(F^{[2]}))$ on $\mathcal{O}(1,0)$ gives a polarization of weight 1.*

Proof By a direct calculation, we have $S^{[2]}\big(f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma(f_\infty^{(0,-1)})\big) = -\big(\sqrt{-1} \cdot t_0^{(0)}\big)$ and $S^{[2]}\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = \sqrt{-1}t_\infty^{(0)}$. Thus we obtain $\sigma\big(S^{[2]}\big(f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma(f_\infty^{(0,-1)})\big)\big) = S^{[2]}\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\big)\big)$. Hence the pairing $S^{[2]}$ is symmetric.

Let us show the second claim. The morphism $S^{[2]}\big(\mathrm{id} \otimes \sigma(F^{[2]})\big)$ gives the composite of the following correspondence:

$$f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big) \longmapsto f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)} \otimes t_\infty^{(-1)}\big) \longmapsto -\sqrt{-1} \cdot \big(-t_0^{(-1)}\big) = \sqrt{-1} \cdot t_0^{(-1)}.$$

On the other hand, $S^{[2]}\big(F^{[2]} \otimes \mathrm{id}\big)$ gives the composite of the following correspondence:

$$f_0^{(1,0)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big) \longmapsto f_0^{(0,-1)} \otimes t_0^{(-1)} \otimes \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big) \longmapsto -\sqrt{-1} \cdot t_0^{(-1)}.$$

Thus we obtain the second claim.

Let us show the third claim. A base of the space $H^0\big(\mathcal{O}(1,0)\otimes\mathcal{O}(-1,0)\big)$ is given by $s = f_0^{(1,0)}\otimes f_0^{(-1,0)} = f_\infty^{(1,0)}\otimes f_\infty^{(-1,0)}$. We have the following:

$$S^{[2]}\big(F^{[2]}(s),\sigma(s)\big) = S^{[2]}\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)}\otimes t_0^{(-1)}\otimes f_\infty^{(-1,0)},\sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\otimes f_0^{(-1,0)}\big)\big) = 1.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Lemma 3.57 *The tuple* $(V^{[2]}, W, F^{[2]}, S^{[2]})$ *is a split polarized mixed twistor structure of weight* 0.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 3.56. ▮

On the other hand, the pairing $S^{[2]}$ induces the pairing $\tilde{S}^{[2]}$ on $\tilde{V}_y^{[2]}$, for we have the relation:

$$S^{[2]}\big(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma(F^{[2]}\otimes t_1^{(1)})\big) + S^{[2]}\big(F^{[2]}\otimes t_1^{(1)}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big) = 0.$$

Lemma 3.58 *The pairing* $\tilde{S}^{[2]}$ *is a polarization of* $\tilde{V}_y^{[2]}$ *of weight* 0.

Proof We have only to show the positivity $\tilde{S}^{[2]}(\tilde{s}_i,\tilde{s}_i) > 0$ for the sections $\tilde{s}_i$ $(i=1,2)$ given in (50). As for $\tilde{s}_1$, we have the following:

$$\tilde{S}^{[2]}\big(\tilde{s}_1,\tilde{s}_1\big) = S^{[2]}\big(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\cdot f_0^{(1,0)}+\sqrt{-1}y\cdot f_0^{(0,-1)},\ \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = \sqrt{-1}y\cdot S^{(0)}\big(f_0^{(0,-1)},\sigma\big(f_\infty^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = y\cdot\sqrt{-1}\cdot\sqrt{-1}^{\,-1} = y.$$

As for $\tilde{s}_2$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{S}^{[2]}(\tilde{s}_2,\tilde{s}_2) &= S^{[2]}\big(-\sqrt{-1}\mu\cdot f_\infty^{(1,0)} - \sqrt{-1}y\cdot f_\infty^{(0,-1)},\sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = S^{[2]}\big(-\sqrt{-1}y\cdot f_\infty^{(0,-1)},\sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\big)\big)\\ &= -\sqrt{-1}y\cdot S^{[2]}\big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)},\sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)}\big)\big) = -\sqrt{-1}y\cdot\sqrt{-1} = y. \qquad (51)\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\tilde{S}^{[2]}(\tilde{s}_i,\tilde{s}_i) > 0$ for $i=1,2$. Thus we are done. ▮

3.7.3 Preliminary on the split Pol-MTS of rank h

Let $h > 1$ be an integer. We put $V^{(1)} := V^{[2]\,\otimes\, h-1}$. We have the naturally defined pairing $S^{(1)} : V^{(1)}\otimes\sigma(V^{(1)}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$, given as follows:

$$S^{(1)}\Big(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{h-1} f_x^{(p_i,q_i)},\ \bigotimes_{i=1}^{h-1}\sigma\big(f_x^{(\tilde{p}_i,\tilde{q}_i)}\big)\Big) = \prod_{i=1}^{h-1} S^{[2]}\big(f_x^{(p_i,q_i)},\sigma\big(f_x^{(\tilde{p}_i,\tilde{q}_i)}\big)\big).$$

Here (p_i,q_i) and $(\tilde{p}_i,\tilde{q}_i)$ denote $(1,0)$ or $(0,-1)$. We also have the morphism $F^{(1)} : V^{(1)} \longrightarrow V^{(1)}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$, which is induced from $F^{[2]}$ by the Leibniz rule.

We have the natural $\mathfrak{S}_{h-1}$-action on $V^{(1)}$. It preserves $S^{(1)}$ and $F^{(1)}$. Then we obtain the invariant part $V^{[h]} = \mathrm{Sym}^{h-1}(V^{(0)})$ and the induced pairing $S^{[h]}$ and the induced morphism $F^{[h]}$. We also have the induced filtration W of $V^{[h]}$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 3.59 *We have the natural grading:*

$$V^{[h]} \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{p+q=h-1,\\ p,q\geq 0}} \mathcal{O}(1,0)^{\otimes p}\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,-1)^{\otimes q}. \qquad (52)$$

The filtration of the left hand side in (52) *is isomorphic to the following filtration of the right hand side:*

$$W_a = \bigoplus_{p-q\leq a} \mathcal{O}(1,0)^{\otimes p}\otimes\mathcal{O}(0,-1)^{\otimes q}.$$

In particular, the vector bundle $V^{[h]}$ *with the filtration* W *is a mixed twistor structure.* ▮

Lemma 3.60 *The tuple* $\big(V^{[h]}, W, F^{[h]}, S^{[h]}\big)$ *is a split polarized mixed twistor structure of weight* 0.

Proof The condition $S^{(1)}\big(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma\big(F^{(1)}\big)\big)+S^{(1)}\big(F^{(1)}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big)=0$ can be checked easily. Then $S^{[h]}\big(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma\big(F^{[h]}\big)\big)+S^{[h]}\big(F^{[h]}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big)=0$ immediately follows.

It is easy to see that there exists a positive number B such that the following holds:

$$\big(F^{[h]}\big)^h\big(f_x^{(1,0)\,\otimes\,h-1}\big)=B\cdot f_x^{(0,-1)\,\otimes\,h-1}.$$

A base of the space of the global sections of $\mathrm{Gr}^W_{h-1}\otimes\mathcal{O}(-h+1,0)$ is given by the following:

$$s=f_0^{(1,0)\,\otimes\,h-1}\otimes f_0^{(-h+1,0)}=f_\infty^{(1,0)\otimes\,h-1}\otimes f_\infty^{(-h+1,0)}.$$

We have the following:

$$S^{[h]}\big(F^{[h]\,h-1}(s),\sigma(s)\big)=B\cdot S^{[h]}\Big(f_\infty^{(0,-1)\,\otimes\,h-1}\otimes f_\infty^{(-h+1,0)},\ \sigma\big(f_0^{(1,0)\,\otimes\,h-1}\otimes f_0^{(-h+1,0)}\big)\Big)=B.$$

Thus $S^{[h]}\big(F^{[h]\,h-1}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big)$ is a polarization on $\mathrm{Gr}^W_{h-1}=P\,\mathrm{Gr}^W_{h-1}$. $\blacksquare$

On the other hand, we have the induced pairing $\tilde{S}^{[h]}$ on $\tilde{V}^{[h]}$.

Lemma 3.61 $\tilde{S}^{[h]}$ *is a polarization of* $\tilde{V}^{[h]}$. *In particular,* $\big(\tilde{V}^{[h]}, W, F^{[h]}, \tilde{S}^{[h]}\big)$ *is a polarized twistor structure of weight* 0.

Proof It is easy to see that $\tilde{S}^{(1)}$ is a polarization of $\tilde{V}^{(1)}$. Then the lemma immediately follows. $\blacksquare$

3.7.4 Classification of split Pol-MTS in one variable

Let us consider the vector bundle $V=\bigoplus_{p+q=h,0\le p,q\le h}\mathcal{O}(p,-q)$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The filtration W is given as follows:

$$W_a:=\bigoplus_{p-q\le a}\mathcal{O}(p,-q).$$

Then (V,W) is a mixed twistor structure.

Lemma 3.62 *Let* (V,W) *be as above. Let* $F: V\longrightarrow V\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$ *be a morphism of mixed twistor structure preserving the grading. Let* $S: V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$ *be a morphism of mixed twistor structures. Assume that* (V,W,F,S) *be a split polarized mixed twistor structure of weight* 0. *Then* (V,W,F,S) *are determined uniquely up to isomorphisms.*

Proof Up to isomorphisms, we may assume that $F:\mathcal{O}(p,-q)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(p-1,-q-1)\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$ is given by $f_x^{(p,-q)}\longmapsto f_x^{(p-1,-q-1)}\otimes t_x^{(-1)}$ for $x=0,1,\infty$. Since we have the relation $S\big(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma(F)\big)+S\big(F\otimes\mathrm{id}\big)=0$, we obtain the following:

$$S\big(f_x^{(p-1,-q-1)},\ \sigma(f_x^{(q+1,-p+1)})\big)+S\big(f_x^{(p,-q)},\ \sigma(f_x^{(q,-p)})\big)=0.$$

Hence S is determined by the number $C=S\big(f_\infty^{(0,-h)}\otimes\sigma(f_0^{(h,0)})\big)$.

We have the following:

$$S\Big(F^h\big(f_\infty^{(h,0)}\otimes f^{(-h,0)}\big),\ \sigma\big(f_0^{(h,0)}\otimes f^{(-h,0)}\big)\Big)=C.$$

Hence we obtain $C>0$. We may assume that $C=1$ up to isomorphisms again. Thus we are done. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 3.10 *Let* V, W, F *and* S *as above. If* (V,W,F,S) *is a split polarized mixed twistor structure, then it is isomorphic to a polarized mixed twistor structure of the form* $(V^{[h]},W,F^{[h]},S^{[h]})$, *given in the subsubsection* 3.7.3.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 3.61 and Lemma 3.62. ▮

Corollary 3.11 *Let (V, W, F, S) be a split polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n. Then it is isomorphic to a split Pol-MTS of weight n of the following form:*

$$\bigoplus_i \bigl(V^{[h_i]}, W, F^{[h_i]}, S^{[h_i]}\bigr) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n)$$

Proof We have only to consider the case $n = 0$. By taking the primitive decomposition, we can reduce the problem to the case $V = \bigoplus_{p+q=h, 0\leq p,q\leq h} \mathcal{O}(p, -q)$. Then the lemma immediately follows from Corollary 3.10. ▮

Lemma 3.63 *Let (V, W, F, S) be a split polarized mixed twistor structure of weight n. Then the twisted vector bundle $\tilde{V}$ is a pure twistor of weight n.*

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 3.11 and Lemma 3.61. ▮

3.7.5 Pol-MTS and nilpotent orbit in one variable

Lemma 3.64 *Let (V, W, f, S) be a Pol-MTS of type $(n, 1)$. Then it is a nilpotent orbit of type $(n, 1)$.*

Proof We put $V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V)$. Then we have the induced tuple $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$. We put as follows:

$$V_0 := V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}, \quad V_\infty := V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}, \quad V_0^{(0)} := V^{(0)}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}, \quad V_\infty^{(0)} := V^{(0)}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}.$$

Let us take frames $\boldsymbol{u}_0^{(0)} = (u_{0\,i}^{(0)})$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty^{(0)} = (u_{\infty\,i}^{(0)})$ of $V_0^{(0)}$ and $V_\infty^{(0)}$ respectively, which are compatible with the natural grading. We take frames $\boldsymbol{u}_0 = (u_{0\,i})$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty = (u_{\infty\,j})$ of V_0 and V_∞ respectively, such that they induce $\boldsymbol{u}_0^{(0)}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty^{(0)}$ respectively. We put as follows:

$$K(i) := \deg^W(u_{0\,i}) = \deg^W(u_{0\,i}^{(0)}), \qquad L(i) := \deg^W(u_{\infty\,i}) = \deg^W(u_{\infty\,i}^{(0)}).$$

We have the relations:

$$u_{\infty\,i}^{(0)} = \sum B_{j\,i}^{(0)} \cdot u_{0\,j}^{(0)}, \quad u_{\infty\,i} = \sum B_{j\,i} \cdot u_{0\,j}.$$

Lemma 3.65

- *We have $B_{j\,i}^{(0)} = 0$ unless $L(i) = K(j)$.*
- *We have $B_{j\,i} = 0$ unless $L(i) \geq K(j)$.*
- *We have $B_{j\,i} = B_{j\,i}^{(0)}$ in the case $L(i) = K(j)$.*

Proof It immediately follows from our choice of the frames. ▮

We have the following relations:

$$f^{(0)} \otimes t_1^{(-1)}(u_{0\,i}^{(0)}) = \sum A_{j\,i}^{(0)} \cdot u_{0\,j}^{(0)}, \quad f \otimes t_1^{(-1)}(u_{0\,i}) = \sum A_{j\,i} \cdot u_{0\,j}.$$

Lemma 3.66

- *We have $A_{i\,j}^{(0)} = 0$ unless $K(j) = K(i) - 2$.*
- *We have $A_{i\,j} = 0$ unless $K(j) \leq K(i) - 2$.*
- *In the case $K(j) = K(i) - 2$, we have $A_{i\,j}^{(0)} = A_{i\,j}$.*

Proof It immediately follows from our choice of the frames. ∎

Let us pick a point $P \in \Delta^*$, and we put $y := -\log|z(P)|^2 > 0$. The restrictions of $\mathrm{Pat}(V^{(0)}, f^{(0)})$ and $\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)$ to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{P\}$ are given by the following gluings:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_\infty^{(0)} = \boldsymbol{u}_0^{(0)} \cdot B^{(0)} \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}y \cdot A^{(0)}\bigr), \quad \boldsymbol{u}_\infty = \boldsymbol{u}_0 \cdot B \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}y \cdot A\bigr).$$

Let us consider the frames $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty(y)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0(y)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty^{(0)}(y)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0^{(0)}(y)$ given as follows:

$$u_{\infty\, i}(y) := y^{-L(i)/2} \cdot u_{\infty\, i}, \quad u_{0\, i}(y) := y^{-K(i)/2} \cdot u_{0\, i},$$

$$u^{(0)}_{\infty\, i}(y) := y^{-L(i)/2} \cdot u^{(0)}_{\infty\, i}, \quad u^{(0)}_{0\, i}(y) := y^{-K(i)/2} \cdot u^{(0)}_{0\, i}.$$

Then it is easy to see that we have the following relation:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_\infty^{(0)}(y) = \boldsymbol{u}_0^{(0)}(y) \cdot B^{(0)} \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}A^{(0)}\bigr). \tag{53}$$

Since $\mathrm{Pat}(V^{(0)}, f^{(0)})$ is a variation of pure twistor structures, the vector bundle whose gluing is given by (53) is pure twistor of weight 0.

On the other hand, we have the following relation:

$$\boldsymbol{u}_\infty(y) = \boldsymbol{u}_0(y) \cdot B(y) \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}A(y)\bigr).$$

Here $B(y)_{i\, j}$ and $A(y)_{i\, j}$ are given as follows:

$$B(y)_{i\, j} := y^{(K(j)-L(i))/2} \cdot B_{i\, j}, \quad A(y)_{i\, j} := y^{(K(j)+2-L(i))/2} \cdot A_{i\, j}.$$

Lemma 3.67 *We have the following:*

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} B(y) \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}A(y)\bigr) = B^{(0)} \cdot \exp\bigl(\sqrt{-1}A^{(0)}\bigr).$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 3.65 and Lemma 3.66. ∎

In particular, there exists a positive constant ϵ such that the restriction of $\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)$ to $\Delta^*(\epsilon)$ is a variation of pure twistor structures.

Let us consider the pairing $\tilde{S}$ on $\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)$. Note that it gives the non-degenerate hermitian pairing of $H^0\bigl(\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)_{|\mathbb{P}^1\times\{P\}}\bigr)$ for any point $P \in \Delta^*(\epsilon)$.

We have the following:

$$S\bigl(u_{0\, i}(y), \sigma\bigl(u_{\infty,j}(y)\bigr)\bigr) = y^{-(L(i)+K(j))/2} \cdot S\bigl(u_{0\, i}, \sigma(u_{\infty,j})\bigr).$$

Hence the limit of S is same as $S^{(0)}$ when we take the limit $y \to \infty$. Hence we obtain the positive definiteness of $\tilde{S}$. Thus the proof of 3.64 is accomplished. ∎

Lemma 3.68 *Let (V, W, f, S) be a split nilpotent orbit of weight n. Then (V, W, f, S) is a split Pol-MTS of type $(n, 1)$.*

Proof By taking the primitive decomposition, we may assume $V = \bigoplus_{p+q=n,0\leq p,q} \mathcal{O}(p, -q)$, and $W_a = \bigoplus_{p-q\leq a} \mathcal{O}(p, -q)$. By taking an appropriate isomorphisms, we may assume that f is naturally defined morphism. Recall that S is determined up to constant multiplication. (See the proof of Lemma 3.62.) Then we may derive that (V, W, f, S) is isomorphic to a mixed twistor of the form $(V^{[h]}, W^{[h]}, f^{[h]}, S^{[h]})$, given in the subsubsection 3.7.3. Thus (V, W, f, S) is a Pol-MTS. ∎

Lemma 3.69 *Let (V, W, f, S) be a nilpotent orbit of type $(n, 1)$. Then (V, W, f, S) is a Pol-MTS of type $(n, 1)$.*

Proof We put $V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V)$, and then we have the induced tuple $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$. We use the notation in the proof of Lemma 3.64. We may assume that the restriction of $\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)$ to $\Delta^*(C)$ is a variation of pure twistor for some $0 < C < 1$. Let pick a point $P \in \Delta^*(C)$. Let us consider the frames $\boldsymbol{u}_\infty(n)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0(n)$, $\boldsymbol{u}^{(0)}_\infty(n)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}^{(0)}_0(n)$ given as follows:

$$u_{\infty\, i}(n) := n^{-L(i)/2} \cdot u_{\infty\, i}, \quad u_{0\, i}(n) := n^{-K(i)/2} \cdot u_{0\, i},$$

$$u^{(0)}_{\infty\, i}(n) := n^{-L(i)/2} \cdot u^{(0)}_{\infty\, i}, \quad u^{(0)}_{0\, i}(n) := n^{-K(i)/2} \cdot u^{(0)}_{0\, i}.$$

By an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.64, the limit vector bundle is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{Pat}(V^{(0)}, f^{(0)})$, when we take the limit $n \to \infty$. Note that $\mathrm{Pat}(V^{(0)}, f^{(0)})$ on Δ^* is always a variation of pure twistors.

The pairings $\tilde{S}(n)$ and $\tilde{S}^{(0)}$ induce the perfect hermitian product of $H^0(\mathrm{Pat}(V, f)_{|P})$ and $H^0(\mathrm{Pat}(V^{(0)}, f^{(0)})_{|P})$. Since the limit of $\tilde{S}(n)$ is $\tilde{S}^{(0)}$, and since $\tilde{S}(n)$ is a positive definite, we obtain the positive definiteness of $\tilde{S}^{(0)}$. It means that $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ is a nilpotent orbit. Due to Lemma 3.68, $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, f^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ is a Pol-MTS. It implies that (V, W, f, S) is a Pol-MTS. ∎

In all, we obtain the following:

Proposition 3.3 *Let (V, W, f, S) be a Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n, 1)$. It is a nilpotent orbit of type $(n, 1)$ if and only if it is a Pol-MTS of type $(n, 1)$.* ∎

3.7.6 The twistor nilpotent orbit of split type

Proposition 3.4 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ be a split Ψ-Pol-MTS of type (n, l). In this case, the induced variation of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles $\big(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}\big)$ a variation of pure twistors of weight 0 over $\Delta^{*\, l}$.*

Moreover, let S be a pairing of V above such that $\big(V, S, \sum a_i f_i\big)$ is a split Pol-MTS. Then the induced pairing $S_{\mathcal{V}}$ of $\mathcal{V}$ gives a polarization of $\big(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\mathcal{V}}\big)$.

Proof We have only to show the following:

- Let P be a point of $\Delta^{*\, l}$. Then $\mathcal{V}_{|\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}$ is isomorphic to a trivial bundle.
- Let S be as above. Then $S_{\mathcal{V}\,|\,\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}$ gives a polarization of the pure twistor $\mathcal{V}_{|\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}$.

Recall that $\mathcal{V}_{|\{P\}\times\mathbb{P}^1}$ is obtained as the twisting of the gluing of V by $\exp\Big(\sqrt{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{l} -\log|z_i(P)|^2 \cdot f_i \otimes t^{(1)}_1\Big)$. Note that we have $-\log|z_i(P)|^2 > 0$. Then the proposition immediately follows from Lemma 3.63. ∎

Corollary 3.12 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ be a split Pol-MTS of type (n, l). Then it is a twistor nilpotent orbit.* ∎

3.7.7 A split Pol-MTS and a nilpotent orbit in Hodge theory

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$ be a split Pol-MTS of type (n, l). Then we can pick a G_m-action on $(V, \boldsymbol{f}, S)$. For example, it is given as follows: For an integer h, the integers $p(h)$ and $q(h)$ are defined as follows: If we have $h = 2m$ for some integer m, then we put $p(h) = q(h) := m$. If we have $h = 2m + 1$ for some integer m, then we put $p(h) := m + 1$ and $q(h) := m$. Then the G_m-action on V can be given by the isomorphism $V \simeq \bigoplus_h V_h \otimes \mathcal{O}\big(p(h), q(h)\big)$. We denote the action by ρ_1.

Lemma 3.70 *$\boldsymbol{f}$ and S are equivariant with respect to ρ_1. If we have a real structure ι of V preserving the grading, then it is also equivariant.*

Proof The equivariance of $\boldsymbol{f}$ and ι is clear. To see that S is equivariant, we have only to check the equivariance of the following morphism:

$$\mathcal{O}\big(p(h_1), q(h_1)\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}\big(p(h_2), q(h_2)\big) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)$$

Here we put $2n = h_1 + h_2$. But it is clear, for we have $p(h_1) + q(h_2) = p(h_2) + q(h_1) = n$. ∎

Corollary 3.13 *Let $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$ be a split Pol-MTS. Let ι be a real structure of $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$. It gives a nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory, when we take an appropriate G_m-action of $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$.* ∎

Corollary 3.14 *Let $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$ be a split Pol-MTS. Then the tuple $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)\oplus\sigma(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$ gives a nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory, when we take an appropriate G_m-action.*

Proof Since we have the canonical real structure on $(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)\oplus\sigma(V,\boldsymbol{f},S)$, it immediately follows from Corollary 3.13. ∎

3.8 The induced tuple on the divisor

3.8.1 The nilpotent orbit on the divisors

Let $(V,W,\boldsymbol{f},S)$ be a nilpotent orbit of type (n,l). We put $V_h^{(1)}:=P\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(f_1)}(V)$. Then we have the induced filtration $W^{(1)}$, the induced morphisms $f_i^{(1)}:V_h^{(1)}\longrightarrow V_h^{(1)}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i=2,\ldots,l)$. The pairing $S\bigl(f_1^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)$ induces the pairing $S_h^{(1)}$. Thus we obtain the induced tuple $\bigl(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{f}^{(1)},S_h^{(1)}\bigr)$, which is a Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$.

Lemma 3.71 *The tuple $\bigl(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{f}^{(1)},S_h^{(1)}\bigr)$ is a nilpotent orbit of type $(n+h,l-1)$.*

Proof We may assume that $n=0$. We have only to show that $\mathrm{Pat}(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{f}^{(1)},S_h^{(1)})$ is a variation of polarized pure twistor of weight h, on $\Delta^{*\,n-1}$. We identify $\Delta^{*\,n-1}$ and D_1°, naturally.

Let us take a point $P\in D_1^{\circ}$. Let $\tilde{P}$ denote the point of $\boldsymbol{C}^l$ such that $\{\tilde{P}\}=q_1^{-1}(1)\cap\pi_1^{-1}(P)$. We put $V(P):=\mathrm{Pat}(V,\boldsymbol{f})_{|\tilde{P}}$. We have the induced filtration $W(P)$, the induced morphism f_1, and the induced pairing S on $V(P)$. Due to Lemma 3.50, the tuple $(V(P),W,f_1,S)$ is a nilpotent orbit. In particular, $(V(P),W,f_1,S)$ is a polarized MTS. It implies that $\mathrm{Pat}(V_h^{(1)},\boldsymbol{f}^{(1)})_{|P}$ is pure twistor of weight h, and $S_h^{(1)}$ is a polarization of $\mathrm{Pat}(V_h^{(1)},\boldsymbol{f}^{(1)})_{|P}$. Thus we are done. ∎

3.8.2 The Pol-MTS on the divisor

Let $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type (n,l). We put $V_h^{(1)}:=P\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V)$, and we obtain the mixed twistor structure $W^{(1)}$ on $V^{(1)}$, and the tuple of induced nilpotent morphisms $N_2^{(1)},\ldots,N_l^{(1)}$. We also obtain the pairing $S_h^{(1)}:V_h^{(1)}\otimes\sigma(V_h^{(1)})\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n-h)$, by putting $S_h^{(1)}:=S(N_1^h\otimes\mathrm{id})$. Then we obtain the tuple $\bigl(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S_h^{(1)}\bigr)$.

Lemma 3.72 *If the tuple $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ is a split Pol-MTS of type (n,l), the induced tuple $(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S^{(1)})$ above is a split Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$.*

Proof It is easy to check that $\bigl(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S^{(1)}\bigr)$ is a split Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$. Since $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ is a nilpotent orbit, the tuple is $(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S^{(1)})$ is also nilpotent orbit, due to Lemma 3.71. In particular, it is a Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$. Thus we are done. ∎

Let $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ be a Ψ-Pol-MTS of type (n,l). Let $(V_b^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S^{(1)})$ be the induced Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n+b,l-1)$. Then we obtain the following induced Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n+b,l-1)$:

$$\Bigl((V_b^{(1)})^{(0)},(W^{(1)})^{(0)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)})^{(0)},(S^{(1)})^{(0)}\Bigr).$$

On the other hand, we have the induced Ψ-Pol-MTS $(V^{(0)},W^{(0)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)},S^{(0)})$ of type (n,l) obtained from $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$. Then we obtain the following induced Ψ-Pol-MTS of type $(n+b,l-1)$ as is given above:

$$\Bigl((V^{(0)})_b^{(1)},(W^{(0)})^{(1)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)})^{(1)},(S^{(0)})^{(1)}\Bigr)$$

Lemma 3.73 *We have the natural isomorphism:*

$$\Big((V_b^{(1)})^{(0)},(W^{(1)})^{(0)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)})^{(0)},(S^{(1)})^{(0)}\Big)\simeq\Big((V^{(0)})_b^{(1)},(W^{(0)})^{(1)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)})^{(1)},(S^{(0)})^{(1)}\Big).$$

Proof We have the two filtrations on Gr_h^W, i.e., $W(N_1^{(0)})$ and $W(N_1)^{(0)}$. We use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.74 *We have* $W(N_1^{(0)})=W(N_1)^{(0)}$.

Proof We have only to check that the filtration $W(N_1)^{(0)}$ satisfies the axioms of weight filtrations for $N_1^{(0)}$. It is easy to see $N_1^{(0)}W(N_1)_h^{(0)}\subset W(N_1)_{h-2}^{(0)}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$. We have $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^W\big)\simeq\mathrm{Gr}_h^W\big(\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\big)$. Since N_1 is a morphism of mixed twistor structures, the following morphism is isomorphic:

$$N_1^b:\mathrm{Gr}_h^W\big(\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\big)\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}_{h-2b}^W\big(\mathrm{Gr}_{-b}^{W(N_1)}\big)\otimes\mathbb{T}(-b).$$

Hence the following morphism is isomorphic:

$$(N_1^{(0)})^b:\bigoplus_h\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^W\big)\simeq\bigoplus_h\mathrm{Gr}_{-b}^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^W\otimes\mathbb{T}(-b)\big).$$

Thus we obtain Lemma 3.74. ▮

Thus we have the canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^W\big)\simeq\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}$. We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^W\big) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, "N_1^{b+1}"'] & \mathrm{Gr}^W\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)} \arrow[d, "N_1^{b+1}"'] \\
Gr_{-b-2}^{W(N_1^{(0)})}\mathrm{Gr}^W\otimes\mathbb{T}(-h) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & \mathrm{Gr}^W\mathrm{Gr}_{-b-2}^{W(N_1)}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-b).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The kernel of the left vertical arrow is the primitive part $P\,\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\mathrm{Gr}^W$ by definition. On the other hand, it is easy to see that the kernel of the right vertical arrow is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}^W P\,\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}$, by using the primitive decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}$. Thus we obtain the canonical isomorphism $\big(V^{(0)}\big)_b^{(1)}\simeq\big(V_b^{(1)}\big)^{(0)}$. Once we obtain the isomorphism of vector bundles, then it is easy to see the coincidence of the filtration, the nilpotent maps and the pairings. Thus we obtain Lemma 3.73. ▮

Proposition 3.5 *Let* $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ *be a Pol-MTS of type* (n,l)*. Then* $(V_h^{(1)},W^{(1)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)},S^{(1)})$ *is a Pol-MTS of type* $(n+h,l-1)$*.*

Proof We have only to show that the tuple $\big((V_h^{(1)})^{(0)},(W^{(1)})^{(0)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)})^{(0)},(S^{(1)})^{(0)}\big)$ is a Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$. Since the tuple $(V^{(0)},W^{(0)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)},S^{(0)})$ is a split Pol-MTS of type (n,l), the induced tuple $((V_h^{(0)})^{(1)},(W^{(0)})^{(1)},(\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)})^{(1)},(S^{(0)})^{(1)})$ is a Pol-MTS of type $(n+h,l-1)$ due to Corollary Lemma 3.72. Then we obtain the result from Lemma 3.73. ▮

3.8.3 Strongly sequentially compatibility

Lemma 3.75 *Let* $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ *be a Pol-MTS of type* (n,l)*. Then* $\boldsymbol{N}$ *is strongly sequentially compatible.*

Proof We use an induction on l. Due to the hypothesis of the induction and Proposition 3.5, the tuple $\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}=(N_2^{(1)},\ldots,N_l^{(1)})$ on $V^{(1)}=\bigoplus V_h^{(1)}$ is sequentially compatible.

Since $(V^{(0)},W^{(0)},\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)},S^{(0)})$ is a nilpotent orbit, $\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}$ is strongly sequentially compatible, which was shown in our previous paper [38]. Hence the conjugacy classes of $N^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{a})$ ($\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}^I$) are constant if we fix a subset $I\subset\underline{l}$. Since the conjugacy classes of $N(\boldsymbol{a})$ and $N^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{a})$ are same, we obtain the constantness of the conjugacy classes of $N(\boldsymbol{a})$ for $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}^I$.

Lemma 3.76 *We have* $W_{h+b}\big(N(\underline{i})\big)^{(1)}\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}=W_b\big(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\big)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}$.

Proof Let $W^{(1)}$ denote the induced mixed twistor structure on $\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}$. Since $W^{(1)}$ gives the mixed twistor structure, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\bigl(W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\bigr)=W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)\,(0)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)},\\
&\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\bigl(W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\bigr)=W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)^{(0)}\cap\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}$ is strongly sequentially compatible, we have the following:

$$W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(0)}\bigr)^{(1)}\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\mathrm{Gr}^W=W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(0)\,(1)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\mathrm{Gr}^W\,.\tag{55}$$

Lemma 3.77 *Under the isomorphism* $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}\simeq\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\mathrm{Gr}^W$*, we have the isomorphisms*

$$W_{h+b}(N(\underline{i})^{(0)})^{(1)}\simeq W_{h+b}(N(\underline{i}))^{(1)\,(0)},\qquad W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(0)\,(1)}\bigr)\simeq W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)^{(0)}.\tag{56}$$

Proof Since the filtration W gives mixed twistor structure, we have $W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(0)}\bigr)^{(1)}=W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})\bigr)^{(0)\,(1)}$, due to Lemma 3.79. Then the first isomorphism is equivalent to the isomorphism $\mathrm{Gr}^W\,Gr_h^{W(N_1)}\bigl(W_{h+b}(N(\underline{i}))\bigr)\simeq\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\mathrm{Gr}^W\bigl(W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})\bigr)\bigr)$, which always holds.

Since the filtration $W^{(1)}$ gives mixed twistor structure, we have $W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)^{(0)}=W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)\,(0)}\bigr)$, due to Lemma 3.79. Thus the second isomorphism is equivalent to $W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(0)\,(1)}\bigr)\simeq W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)\,(0)}\bigr)$. It follows from the equality $N(\underline{i})^{(0)\,(1)}=N(\underline{i})^{(1)(0)}$ under the isomorphism $Gr^{W^{(1)}}\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\simeq Gr_h^{W(N_1)^{(0)}}\mathrm{Gr}^W$. Thus we obtain Lemma 3.77. ∎

From (54), (55) and (56), we obtain the following:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\bigl(W_{h+b}\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\bigr)=\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{(1)}}\bigl(W_b\bigl(N(\underline{i})^{(1)}\bigr)\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}\bigr)\tag{57}$$

Then Lemma 3.76 follows from (57) and Lemma 3.80 below. ∎

Lemma 3.78 *We have* $W_{h+b}(N(\underline{i}))^{(1)}\cap V_h^{(1)}=W_b(N(\underline{i})^{(1)})\cap V_h^{(1)}$.

Proof Since $N(\underline{i})^{(1)}$ is compatible with the primitive decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}$, the filtration $W(N(\underline{i})^{(1)})$ is compatible with the primitive decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{W(N_1)}$. Then Lemma 3.78 follows from Lemma 3.76. ∎

We would like to show the surjectivity of the morphism

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}W_{h_i}(\underline{i})\longrightarrow\bigcap_{i=2}^{l}W_{h_i}^{(1)}(\underline{i})\cap\mathrm{Gr}_{h_i}^{W(N_1)}\,.\tag{58}$$

The morphism (58) induces the morphism on the associated graded vector bundles for $W=W(\underline{l})$, and the induced morphism is surjective. Thus the morphism (58) itself is surjective. Similarly, we can show the surjectivity of the following morphism:

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,N_1^{h_1}\cap\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}W_{h_i}(\underline{i})\longrightarrow\bigcap_{i=2}^{l}W_{h_i}^{(1)}(\underline{i})\cap P_{h_1}\,\mathrm{Gr}_{h_1}^{W(\underline{1})}\,.$$

Thus we obtain the strongly sequential compatibility, i.e., the proof of Lemma 3.75 is accomplished. ∎

3.8.4 Lemmas for mixed twistor structure

Lemma 3.79 *Let (V, W) be a mixed twistor structure. Let $f : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ be a nilpotent morphism of mixed twistor structure. Let $W(f)$ be the weight filtration of f. We have the induced mixed twistor structure $V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V)$ and the induced morphism $f^{(0)} : V^{(0)} \longrightarrow V^{(0)} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$. We also have the induced filtration $W(f)^{(0)}$. Then we have $W(f^{(0)}) = W(f)^{(0)}$.*

Proof In the case $f^{h+1} = 0$, we have $W_{-h}(f) = \mathrm{Im}(f^h)$ and $W_h(f) = \mathrm{Ker}(f^h)$. Since f is strict with respect to the filtration W, we obtain $W_{-h}(f)^0 = W_{-h}(f^{(0)})$ and $W_h(f)^{(0)} = W_h(f^{(0)})$. Due to the recursive construction of the weight filtration (see [13]), we obtain $W_k(f)^{(0)} = W_k(f^{(0)})$ for any k. ▮

Lemma 3.80 *Let (V, W) be a MTS. Let $V_i \subset V$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be sub MTS. Assume that $\mathrm{Gr}^W(V_1) = \mathrm{Gr}^W(V_2)$ in $\mathrm{Gr}^W(V)$. Then we have $V_1 = V_2$.*

Proof We have only to show $W_h \cap V_1 = W_h \cap V_2$ for any h.

1. We put $h_0 := \min\{h \mid \dim W_h \cap V_1 \neq 0\}$. Then $W_{h_0} \cap V_i \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h_0}(V_i) \subset \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h_0}(V)$. We put $U := \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h_0}(V_1) = \mathrm{Gr}^W_{h_0}(V_2)$. Then $W_{h_0} \cap V_i$ give the isomorphism $\phi_i : U \longrightarrow W_{h_0} \cap V_i \subset V$. Then $(\phi_1 - \phi_2)(U) \subset W_{h_0-1}(V)$. Since U is pure twistor of weight h_0, we obtain $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = 0$, i.e., $W_{h_0} \cap V_1 = W_{h_0} \cap V_2$.

2. We assume that the claim holds for $h-1$, and then we will show the claim for h. We put $K := W_{h-1} \cap V_1 = W_{h-1} \cap V_2$. It is sub MTS of V. Thus V/K is also a MTS, and $V_i/K \subset V/K$ $(i = 1, 2)$ satisfies the condition. Thus the problem is reduced to the previous case. ▮

3.9 Translation of some results due to Kashiwara, Kawai and Saito

3.9.1 Vanishing cycle theorem due to Kashiwara-Kawai

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type (n, l). We put $V^{(1)} := \mathrm{Im}(N_1)$. Since $N_1 : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ is a morphism of mixed twistors, $V^{(1)}$ is a sub mixed twistor of $V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$. The filtrations $W^{(1)}$ and the tuple of the nilpotent maps $\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}$ on $V^{(1)}$ are naturally induced. Since $V^{(1)}$ is a subbundle of $V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$, we have the naturally induced pairing $S' : V \otimes \sigma(V^{(1)}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n-1)$. It is easy to see that S' vanishes on $\mathrm{Ker}(N_1) \otimes \sigma(V^{(1)})$. Hence we obtain the induced pairing $S^{(1)} : V^{(1)} \otimes \sigma(V^{(1)}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n-1)$.

Lemma 3.81 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a split Pol-MTS of type (n, l). Then the induced tuple $(V^{(1)}, W^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ is a split Pol-MTS of type $(n+1, l)$.*

Proof Recall that we can pick a torus action on $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$, and then it is regarded as a nilpotent orbit in the Hodge theory (See Corollary 3.14). Thus the lemma is a consequence of the vanishing cycle theorem due to Kashiwara-Kawai (Theorem 2.15 in [30]). ▮

For a polarized mixed twistor structure $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$, we put $V^{(0)} := \mathrm{Gr}^W(V)$. Then we have the induced split Pol-MTS $(V^{(0)}, W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, S^{(0)})$ of type (n, l). By applying the construction above, we obtain $(V^{(0)\,(1)}, W^{(0)\,(1)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)\,(1)}, S^{(0)\,(1)})$.

On the other hand, we obtain the tuple $(V^{(1)}, W^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$. It is easy to check that the tuple is a Ψ-Pol MTS of type (n, l). Hence we obtain the induced tuple $(V^{(1)\,(0)}, W^{(1)\,(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(1)\,(0)}, S^{(1)\,(0)})$.

Lemma 3.82 *The tuples $(V^{(0)\,(1)}, W^{(0)\,(1)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)\,(1)}, S^{(0)\,(1)})$ and $(V^{(1)\,(0)}, W^{(1)\,(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(1)\,(0)}, S^{(1)\,(0)})$ are naturally isomorphic.*

Proof It is clear from our constructions. ▮

Proposition 3.6 *Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type (n, l). We put $V^{(1)} := \mathrm{Im}(N_1)$. Then the naturally induced tuple $(V^{(1)}, W^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ is a Pol-MTS of type (n, l).*

Proof It follows from Lemma 3.81 and Lemma 3.82. ▮

3.9.2 Kashiwara's Lemma

Let V be a vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{N}$ be a tuple of nilpotent maps $N_i : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$. Let N be a variable, and we put as follows:

$$V[N] := \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} V \otimes \mathbb{T}(i) \cdot N^i.$$

We have the natural mixed twistor structure W on the infinite dimensional vector bundle $V[N]$. We have the natural morphism of mixed twistor structures:

$$N : V[N] \longrightarrow V[N] \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1), \quad u \cdot N^i \longmapsto u \cdot N^{i+1}.$$

For a subset $I \subset \underline{l}$, we have the morphism:

$$\prod_{i \in I} (N - N_i) : V[N] \otimes \mathbb{T}(n) \longrightarrow V[N].$$

Then we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{V}_I(V, \boldsymbol{N}) := V[N] \Big/ \prod_{i \in I} (N - N_i) \simeq \bigoplus_{i=0}^{|I|-1} V \otimes \mathbb{T}(i) \cdot N^i. \tag{59}$$

In the case $I = \underline{l_1}$, we use the notation $\mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V, \boldsymbol{N})$ instead of $\mathcal{V}_{\underline{l_1}}(V, \boldsymbol{N})$. We often omit to denote $\boldsymbol{N}$.

Let (V, W) be a mixed twistor structure and $\boldsymbol{N}$ be a tuple of morphisms $N_i : V \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ of mixed twistors. We have the induced filtration W and the induced morphisms N, N_i on $(\mathcal{V}_I, W)$. The following lemma is clear from the construction.

Lemma 3.83 *The morphisms N and N_i are morphisms of mixed twistor structures.* ▮

Corollary 3.15 *The conjugacy classes of $aN + \sum b_i N_i$ are independent of $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$.* ▮

We put $\tilde{\boldsymbol{N}} := (N, N_1, \ldots, N_l)$. Thus we obtain the mixed twistor structure $(\mathcal{V}_I, W)$ and the tuple of nilpotent maps $\tilde{\boldsymbol{N}}$.

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS(n, l). We have the induced object $(\mathcal{V}_I, \mathcal{W}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{N}})$. We have the induced pairing $V(i) \otimes \sigma\big(V(j)\big) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n + i + j)$, which we also denote by S. We have the induced morphism $S' : V[N, N^{-1}] \otimes \sigma(V[N, N^{-1}]) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)[N, N^{-1}]$, defined as follows:

$$S\big(u \cdot N^i, \sigma(v \cdot N^j)\big) := (-1)^j \cdot S\big(u, \sigma(v)\big) \cdot N^{i+j}.$$

Since N_i are nilpotent, we have the morphism:

$$\prod_{i \in I} (N - N_i)^{-1} : V[N] \longrightarrow V[N] \otimes \mathbb{T}(|I|).$$

Then we have the following element of $\mathbb{T}(-n + |I| - k)[N, N^{-1}]$ for any $f_i \in V \otimes \mathbb{T}(i)$ and $g_j \in V \otimes \mathbb{T}(j)$, and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$S'\Big(\prod_{i \in I} (N - N_i)^{-1} f_i \otimes N^{i+k},\ \sigma\big(g_j \cdot N_j\big)\Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^I} (-1)^j \cdot N^{-|I| + i + j + k - |\boldsymbol{n}|} S\Big(\prod_{i \in I} N_a^{n_a} f_i, \sigma(g_j)\Big) \in \mathbb{T}(-n + |I| - k)[N].$$

By taking the residue, i.e., the $N^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{T}(-n + |I| - k - 1)$-component, we obtain the morphism: $\mathcal{V}_I(S) : V[N, N^{-1}] \otimes \sigma(V[N, N^{-1}]) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n + |I| - k - 1)$:

$$\mathcal{V}_I(S)\big(f(N), \sigma\big(g(N)\big)\big) = \mathrm{Res}_{N=0}\, S'\Big(\tilde{N}_I^{-1} \cdot f(N), \sigma\big(g(N)\big)\Big). \tag{60}$$

Here we put $\tilde{N}_I := \prod_{i \in I} (N - N_i)$.

Lemma 3.84 *We have the following formula for* $f = \sum f_i \cdot N^i$ *and* $\sum g_j \cdot N^j$ *and for any* $k \in \mathbb{Z}$*:*

$$\mathcal{V}_I(S)\big(f(N)\cdot N^k,\ \sigma\big(g(N)\big)\big) = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{-|I|-|\boldsymbol{n}|+i+j+k=-1} (-1)^j \cdot S\Big(\prod_{a\in I} N_a^{n_a}\cdot f_i,\ \sigma(g_j)\Big) \in \mathbb{T}(-n+|I|-1-k).$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ▮

Then we obtain $\mathcal{V}_I(S) : \mathcal{V}_I(V)\otimes\sigma(\mathcal{V}_I(V)) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n+|I|-1)$. Thus we obtain the tuple $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_I(V)\big)$.

The signature of the construction in [46] looks slightly different from that in the above construction at a sight. Let us see that they are same, in fact. Recall the construction in [46]. To distinguish, we use the variable s. We also denote the given nilpotent maps of V by s_i. Note the relation $s_i = -N_i$. (See Remark 3.3, for example.)

We obtain the vector bundle $\mathcal{V}_I(V)^{(1)} := V[s]/\prod_{i\in I}(s-s_i)$. The extended pairing $S^{(1)} : V[s,s^{-1}]\otimes\sigma(V)[s,s^{-1}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n)[s,s^{-1}]$ given in [46] is as follows:

$$S^{(1)}(u\cdot s^i, v\cdot s^j) = (-1)^i\cdot S(u,v)\cdot s^{i+j}.$$

Then we obtain the pairing $\tilde{S}^{(1)}$, given as follows:

$$\tilde{S}^{(1)}(s^i\cdot u, s^j\cdot v) := \operatorname{Res}_{s=0} S^{(1)}\big(u\cdot s^i,\ \tilde{s}_I^{-1}\cdot v\cdot s^j\big).$$

Here $\tilde{s}_I$ denote $\prod_{i\in I}(s-s_i)$.

Since we have the relation $s_i = -N_i$, the correspondence $N \longmapsto -s$ induces the isomorphism $V[N] \simeq V[s]$, and $\mathcal{V}_I(V) \simeq \mathcal{V}_I(V)^{(1)}$.

Lemma 3.85 *Under the isomorphism, we have* $\tilde{S}(N^i u, N^j v) = \tilde{S}^{(1)}(s^i u, s^j v)$*.*

Proof We put $\mathcal{S} := \big\{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^I \bigm| -|I|-|\boldsymbol{l}|+i+j=-1\big\}$. By a direct calculation, we have the following:

$$\tilde{S}(N^i u, N^j v) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{S}} (-1)^j\cdot S\Big(\prod N_k^{l_k} u, v\Big). \tag{61}$$

We also have the following:

$$\tilde{S}^{(1)}(s^i u, s^j v) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{S}} (-1)^i\cdot S\Big(u, \prod s_k^{l_k} v\Big). \tag{62}$$

Let us substitute $s=-N$ and $s_i=-N_i$ in (62), then we obtain the following:

$$(-1)^{i+j}\tilde{S}^{(1)}\big(N^i u, N^j v\big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{S}} (-1)^i\cdot S\Big(u, \prod(-N_k)^{l_k} v\Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{l}\in\mathcal{S}} (-1)^i\cdot S\Big(\prod N_k^{l_k} u, v\Big).$$

Since it is same as (61), Lemma 3.85 is shown. ▮

Lemma 3.86 *Let* $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ *be a split Pol-MTS of type* (n, ln)*. Then the induced tuple* $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_I(V)\big)$ *is a split Pol-MTS of type* $(n-|I|+1, l+1)$*.*

Proof Clearly we have a splitting. We put $(V', W', \boldsymbol{N}', S') = (V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)\oplus\sigma(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$, which gives an $\boldsymbol{R}$-nilpotent orbit. Then $\big(\mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V'), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V')\big)$ is an $\boldsymbol{R}$-nilpotent orbit. Since we have the following:

$$\big(\mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V'), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_{l_1}(S)\big) = \big(\mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_{l_1}(S)\big)\oplus\sigma\big(\mathcal{V}_{l_1}(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_{l_1}(S)\big).$$

Thus it follows from the original Kashiwara's lemma (Proposition 3.19 [46] and Appendix [46]). Or, it is not difficult to apply Kashiwara's argument in Appendix in [46] to the nilpotent twistor orbits. ▮

Corollary 3.16 *Let* $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ *be a Pol-MTS of type* (n, l)*. Then* $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_I(S)\big)$ *is a Pol-MTS of type* $(n-|I|+1, l+1)$*.*

Proof It is easy to check that the tuple $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_I(S)\big)$ satisfies the first three conditions. Then the tuple $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V)_I^{(0)}, \mathcal{W}^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, \mathcal{V}_I(S)^{(0)}\big)$ is naturally isomorphic to the tuple obtained from $\big(\mathcal{V}_I(V^{(0)}), \mathcal{W}, \boldsymbol{N}^{(0)}, \mathcal{V}_I(S^{(0)})\big)$. Thus we are done. ▮

3.9.3 Preliminary lemma

In the subsubsections 3.9.3–3.9.5, we recall the argument given by Saito in the page 302 in [46]. See also the original argument.

Let $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ be an equivariant $\boldsymbol{R}$-nilpotent orbit of of (n,l). Let $(\hat{V},\hat{W},\hat{\boldsymbol{N}},\hat{S})$ be an equivariant $\boldsymbol{R}$-nilpotent orbit of type $(n-1,l)$. Let $f : V \longrightarrow \hat{V}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$ and $g : \hat{V} \longrightarrow V$ be morphisms of MTS, such that

- $g\circ f = N_2 : V \longrightarrow V\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$.
- $f\circ g = \hat{N}_2 : \hat{V} \longrightarrow \hat{V}\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$.
- $\hat{S}(f\otimes\mathrm{id}) = S(\mathrm{id}\otimes g)$.

Then we have the induced morphisms

$$f^{(1)} : P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) \longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V})\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1),$$

$$g^{(1)} : P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) \longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V).$$

Lemma 3.87 *In the case $l=2$, we have the following decomposition:*

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) = \operatorname{Ker} g^{(1)} \oplus \Bigl(\operatorname{Im}(f^{(1)})\otimes\mathbb{T}(1)\Bigr)$$

Proof It is easy to see that $f^{(1)}$ and $g^{(1)}$ are morphisms of mixed twistor structures, and that we have $f^{(1)}\circ g^{(1)} = \hat{N}_2^{(1)}$ and $g^{(1)}\circ f^{(1)} = N_2^{(1)}$. We also have $\hat{S}^{(1)}(f^{(1)}\otimes 1) = \hat{S}(1\otimes g^{(1)})$.

We have the induced morphisms

$$f^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}_a^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}_{a-2}^W\bigl(P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V})\bigr)\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1),$$

$$g^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}_a^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}_a^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V).$$

In all, we have the following:

$$f^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}^W(P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}))\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1),$$

$$g^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V).$$

We have only to show $\operatorname{Im}(f^{(2)})\otimes\mathbb{T}(1)\oplus\operatorname{Ker} g^{(2)} = \operatorname{Gr}^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V})$.

Note the following equalities:

$$\operatorname{Gr}_a^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) = \operatorname{Gr}_{a-n-h}^{W(N_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V),$$

$$\operatorname{Gr}_a^W P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) = \operatorname{Gr}_{a-n+1-h}^{W(\hat{N}_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(V).$$

Thus $f^{(2)}$ and $g^{(2)}$ can be regarded as the morphisms:

$$f^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(N_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}_{a-1}^{W(\hat{N}_2)}(P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_2)}(\hat{V}))\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$$

$$g^{(2)} : \operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(\hat{N}_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(\hat{V}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}_{a-1}^{W(N_2)}(P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V)).$$

We put $n+h+1=n'$ and as follows:

$$H^a := \operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(N_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V) \qquad \text{weight } a+n'-1$$

$$\hat{H}^a := \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N_2^{(1)})} P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V})\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1) \qquad \text{weight } a+n'$$

Then we obtain the following morphisms:

$$f^{(2)} : H^a \longrightarrow \hat{H}^{a-1},$$

$$g^{(2)} : \hat{H}^a \longrightarrow H^{a-1} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1),$$

We also have the pairings:

$$S^{(2)} : H^a \otimes \sigma H^{-a} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n'+1),$$

$$\hat{S}^{(2)} : \hat{H}^a \otimes \sigma \hat{H}^{-a} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(-n').$$

We have $\hat{S}^{(2)}(f^{(2)} \otimes \mathrm{id}) = S^{(2)}(1 \otimes g^{(2)})$, and we have the polarizations $S^{(2)}(N^{(2)\,a} \otimes \mathrm{id})$ and $\hat{S}^{(2)}(\hat{N}^{(2)\,a} \otimes \mathrm{id})$. Then the problem is reduced to Lemma 5.2.15 of [44]. ∎

Proposition 3.7 *We have the following decomposition for any* l*:*

$$P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(\hat{N}_1)}(\hat{V}) = \operatorname{Ker} g^{(1)} \oplus \Big(\operatorname{Im}(f^{(1)}) \otimes \mathbb{T}(1)\Big)$$

Proof We put $X = \Delta^l$, $D_i = \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h, \theta)$ and $(\hat{E}, \overline{\partial}_{\hat{E}}, \hat{h}, \hat{\theta})$ be the harmonic bundles over $X - D$, corresponding to $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ and $(\hat{V}, \hat{W}, \hat{\boldsymbol{N}}, \hat{S})$ respectively. Since we discuss in the category of mixed twistor structures, such decomposition holds at $\lambda = 1$ if and only if such decomposition holds over $\mathbb{P}^1$. Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{D})$ and $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}, \hat{\mathbb{D}})$ be the associated deformed holomorphic bundles, and ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ and ${}^\diamond\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ be the canonical prolongment.

The morphisms f and g induce the morphisms $F : {}^\diamond\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow {}^\diamond\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ and $G : {}^\diamond\hat{\mathcal{E}} \longrightarrow {}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$, which are flat with respect to the λ-connections $\mathbb{D}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{D}}$.

Let us pick a point $Q \in D_1 \cap D_2 - \bigcup_{j>2}\big(D_i \cap D_1 \cap D_2\big)$. By using the normalizing frame, we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\big({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\,(1,O)}, \operatorname{Res}_1(\mathbb{D}), \operatorname{Res}_2(\mathbb{D})\big) \simeq \big({}^\diamond\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{|\,(1,Q)}, \operatorname{Res}_1(\mathbb{D}), \operatorname{Res}_2(\mathbb{D})\big)$$

We have a similar isomorphism for $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$. Hence we have only to show the following decomposition:

$$\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}({}^\diamond\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{|(1,Q)}) = \operatorname{Im}(F_{|(1,Q)}) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(G_{|(1,Q)}). \tag{63}$$

Let $\pi : X \longrightarrow D_1 \cap D_2$ denote the projection onto the first two components. We obtain the surface $\pi^{-1}(Q) \simeq \Delta^2 \subset X$. The restrictions of $(E_i, \overline{\partial}_{E_i}, h_i, \theta_i)$ to $\pi^{-1}(Q)$ are nilpotent orbits (Lemma 3.50, for example). Thus we obtain the decomposition (63) from Lemma 3.87. Thus the proof of Proposition 3.7 is accomplished. ∎

3.9.4 The preliminary decomposition

Let us consider a pair $\boldsymbol{I} = (J, K)$ of subsets J and K of $\underline{l}$, such that $J \cap K = \emptyset$ and $J \neq \emptyset$. For such pair, we put $|\boldsymbol{I}| := |J| + |K|$. For two pairs $\boldsymbol{I}_i = (J_i, K_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, we mean $J_1 \subset J_2$ and $K_1 \subset K_2$ by $\boldsymbol{I}_1 \subset \boldsymbol{I}_2$. In the case $\boldsymbol{I}_1 \subset \boldsymbol{I}_2$, we put $\boldsymbol{I}_1 - \boldsymbol{I}_2 := (J_2 - J_1) \cup (K_2 - K_1)$.

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type (n, l). We put $N_K := \prod_{k \in K} N_k$. We have the naturally induced filtration W the tuple of the nilpotent maps $\boldsymbol{N}$, and the pairing S on $\operatorname{Im}(N_K)$. Due to Proposition 3.6, the tuple $(\operatorname{Im}(N_K), W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ is a Pol-MTS of type $(n + |K|, l)$. By the construction given in the subsubsection 3.9.2, we obtain the Pol-MTS $\mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K))$ of type $(n + |K| - |J| + 1, l + 1)$ (See Corollary 3.16).

Let us pick an element i of K, and we put $K' := K - \{i\}$. The inclusion $\operatorname{Im}(N_K) \subset \operatorname{Im}(N_{K'}) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ is denoted by var_i. The morphism N_i induces the morphism $\operatorname{Im}(N_{K'}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Im}(N_K)$, which is denoted by can_i. The morphism var_i and can_i induce the morphisms $\mathrm{var}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_{K'})) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ and $\mathrm{can}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_{K'})) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K))$.

Let us pick an element $i \in J$, and we put $J' := J - \{i\}$. The identity of $\operatorname{Im}(N_K)[N]$ induces the morphism $\mathrm{var}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{J'}(\operatorname{Im}(N_K))$. The morphism $(N - N_i) : \operatorname{Im}(N_K)[N] \longrightarrow \operatorname{Im}(N_K)[N] \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ induces the morphism $\mathrm{can}_i : \mathcal{V}_{J'}(\operatorname{Im}(N_K)) \otimes \mathbb{T}(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K))$.

We introduce the following notation. For a pair $\boldsymbol{I} = (J, K)$ as above, we put $\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}} := \mathcal{V}_J(\operatorname{Im}(N_K)) \otimes \mathbb{T}\big(|K|\big)$. Then we obtain the morphisms $\mathrm{can}_i : \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ and $\mathrm{var}_i : \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'}$ for $\boldsymbol{I}' \subset \boldsymbol{I}$ such that $\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{I}' = \{i\}$. They induce the morphisms $\mathrm{can}_i : P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'} \longrightarrow P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ and $\mathrm{var}_i : P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}} \longrightarrow P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'}$.

Proposition 3.8 *Let $\boldsymbol{I}=(J,K)$ be a pair of subsets J and K of $\underline{l}$ such that $J\cap K=\emptyset$ and $J\neq\emptyset$. Let $\boldsymbol{I}'$ be a pair of subsets such that $\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{I}'=\{i\}$. Then we have the following decomposition:*

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\bigr)=\operatorname{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i)\oplus\operatorname{Im}\bigl(\mathrm{can}_i\otimes\mathbb{T}(1)\bigr).$$

Proof It follows from Proposition 3.7. ∎

3.9.5 The decomposition

For pairs $\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}$, we have the naturally defined morphisms $\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'}\longrightarrow\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ and $\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\longrightarrow\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'}$:

$$\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):=\prod_{i\in\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{I}'}\mathrm{can}_i,\qquad\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):=\prod_{i\in\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{I}'}\mathrm{var}_i\,.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{I}_i=(J_i,K_i)$ $(i=0,1,2,3)$ be pairs of subsets of $\underline{l}$. We assume $\boldsymbol{I}_1\cap\boldsymbol{I}_2:=(J_1\cap J_2,K_1\cap K_2)=\boldsymbol{I}_0$, and $\boldsymbol{I}_1\cup\boldsymbol{I}_2:=(J_1\cup J_2,K_1\cup K_2)=\boldsymbol{I}_3$.

Lemma 3.88 *The following morphisms are commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_0} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_1)"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_2)"'] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"'] \\
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_2} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_3},
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_0} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_1)"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_2)"'] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"'] \\
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_2} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_3},
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_0} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_1)"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_2)"'] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"'] \\
\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_2} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_3)"] & \mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_3}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof It can be directly checked from the definition. ∎

For $\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}$, we obtain the morphisms $\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'})\longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})$ and $\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I}):P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})\longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}'})$.

Proposition 3.9 *For $\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}$, we have the following decomposition:*

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\bigr)=\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\bigr)\oplus\operatorname{Im}\bigl(\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\otimes\mathbb{T}(|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|)\bigr).\tag{64}$$

Proof We use an induction on $|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|$. The case $|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|=1$ is shown in Proposition 3.8. We assume that the claim holds in the case $|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|<a$, and we will prove that the claim also holds in the case $|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|=a$.

We take $\boldsymbol{I}_i$ $(i=0,1,2,3)$ as in Lemma 3.88 satisfying the following:

$$\boldsymbol{I}_0=\boldsymbol{I}',\qquad\boldsymbol{I}_3=\boldsymbol{I},\qquad\boldsymbol{I}_0\subsetneq\boldsymbol{I}_i\subsetneq\boldsymbol{I}_3,\ (i=1,2).$$

Due to the hypothesis of the induction, we have the following decompositions:

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_3}\bigr)=\operatorname{Im}\bigl(\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_3)\bigr)\oplus\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_3)\bigr),\quad P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1}\bigr)=\operatorname{Im}\bigl(\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_1)\bigr)\oplus\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_0,\boldsymbol{I}_1)\bigr).\tag{65}$$

Here we have omitted to denote the Tate twist, for simplicity.

Due to the commutativity in Lemma 3.88, the morphism $\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}_3)$ and $\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}_3)$ are compatible with the decompositions in (65). Then it is easy to derive the decomposition (64) for $\boldsymbol{I}=\boldsymbol{I}_3$ and $\boldsymbol{I}'=\boldsymbol{I}_0$. ∎

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}:=\bigcap_{\boldsymbol{I}'\subsetneq\boldsymbol{I}}\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\bigr)\subset P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\bigr).$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}'}:=\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\bigl(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}'}\bigr)\subset P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\bigr).$$

Lemma 3.89 *We have the following:*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}=\bigcap_{\substack{\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I},\\|\boldsymbol{I}|-|\boldsymbol{I}'|=1}}\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\bigr)\subset P_h\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigl(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\bigr).$$

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 3.9. ∎

Lemma 3.90 *Let us consider pairs* $\boldsymbol{I}_i \subset \boldsymbol{I}$ $(i=1,2)$*. Assume* $\boldsymbol{I}_1 \not\subset \boldsymbol{I}_2$*. Then we have* $\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I})\big(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}}\big)=0$.

Proof It immediately follows from the commutativity (Lemma 3.88) as follows:

$$\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I})\big(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I}}\big)=\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I})\circ\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_1,\boldsymbol{I})\big(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1}\big)=\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_1\cap\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_2)\circ\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_1\cap\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I}_1)\big(\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}_1}\big)=0.$$

∎

Lemma 3.91 *Let us consider sub-pairs* $\boldsymbol{I}_1\subset\boldsymbol{I}_2\subset\boldsymbol{I}$*. Then the restriction of the morphism* $\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I})_{|\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}_1}}$ *is injective.*

Proof It follows from $\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}_1}\subset\mathrm{Im}\big(\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}_2,\boldsymbol{I})\big)$ and the decomposition in Proposition 3.9. ∎

Lemma 3.92 *The naturally defined morphism* $\phi:\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}}\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}'}\longrightarrow P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ *is onto.*

Proof It follows from the surjectivity of $\sum\mathrm{Im}\big(\mathrm{can}(\boldsymbol{I}',\boldsymbol{I})\big)\oplus\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}\longrightarrow P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})$. ∎

Proposition 3.10 *We have the following decomposition:*

$$P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})\simeq\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{I}'\subset\boldsymbol{I}}\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}'}.$$

Proof We have only to show the injectivity of ϕ in Lemma 3.92. Assume that $\sum v_{\boldsymbol{I}'}=0$, where $v'_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ are elements of $\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{I}'}$. We put $\mathcal{S}=\{\boldsymbol{I}'\,|\,v_{\boldsymbol{I}'}\neq 0\}$. Assume that $\mathcal{S}\neq\emptyset$, and we will derive a contradiction. Let $\boldsymbol{I}'_0$ be the minimal element. Then we obtain the following:

$$0=\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}'_0,\boldsymbol{I})\Big(\sum v_{\boldsymbol{I}'}\Big)=\mathrm{var}(\boldsymbol{I}'_0,\boldsymbol{I})(v_{\boldsymbol{I}'_0})$$

It implies $v_{\boldsymbol{I}'_0}=0$ due to Lemma 3.91. But it contradicts our choice of $\boldsymbol{I}'_0$. Thus we obtain Proposition 3.10. ∎

Lemma 3.93 *For a pair* $\boldsymbol{I}=(J,K)$*,* $\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$ *is pure twistor of weight* $n-|J|+1+h$*. The pairing of* $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})$ *induce the polarization on* $\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$*.*

Proof $\mathcal{C}_I$ is a direct summand of $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}})$. On $\mathcal{C}_I$, the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i$ $(i\in\boldsymbol{I})$ are 0, by definition of $\mathcal{C}_I$. Thus the weight filtration $\mathcal{W}(I)$ induced by $\sum_{i\in I}\mathcal{N}_i$ is trivial on $\mathcal{C}_I$. Recall that the filtration $\mathcal{W}(I)$ is same as the induced mixed twistor structure of $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\mathcal{U}_{\boldsymbol{I}}$, up to shift of the degree. Thus we obtain the first claim. The second claim can be shown similarly. ∎

3.10 $\mathcal{R}$-triple and twistor structure

3.10.1 Perfect strict $\mathcal{R}$-triple and vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$

Definition 3.15 $\mathcal{T}=(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C)$ *be* $\mathcal{R}$*-triple in* 0*-dimension (See* [42]*). It is called perfect and strict if the following holds:*

- *The* $\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$*-modules* $\mathcal{M}'$ *and* $\mathcal{M}''$ *are locally free.*
- *The sesqui-linear pairing* $C:\mathcal{M}'(\boldsymbol{A})\otimes\overline{\mathcal{M}''(\boldsymbol{A})}\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$ *is perfect.* ∎

Let V be a vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$. We put $V_0:=V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ and $V_\infty:=V_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}$. We have the natural perfect pairing $C_V:V_0^\vee(\boldsymbol{A})\otimes\sigma V_\infty(\boldsymbol{A})\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$. We put $\Theta(V)=\big(V_0^\vee,\sigma(V_\infty),C_V\big)$, which is a strict perfect $\mathcal{R}$-triple.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{T}=(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C)$ is a strict perfect $\mathcal{R}$-triple, then C induces the isomorphism $\mathcal{M}'^{\vee}_{|\boldsymbol{A}}\simeq\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{M}'')_{|\boldsymbol{A}}$. Thus we obtain the vector bundle $V(\mathcal{T})$.

Let $V^{(i)}$ $(i=1,2)$ be a locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$-modules, and let $f:V^{(1)}\longrightarrow V^{(2)}$ be a morphism of $\mathcal{O}$-sheaves. Then we obtain the morphism $\big(f_0^\vee,\sigma(f_\infty)\big):\Theta(V^{(1)})\longrightarrow\Theta(V^{(2)})$.

Lemma 3.94 *By the correspondence above, we obtain the equivalence of the following categories:*

$$\Theta : (\textit{vector bundle over } \mathbb{P}^1) \longrightarrow (\textit{strict perfect } \mathcal{R}\textit{-triple})$$

∎

For perfect strict $\mathcal{R}$-triples $\mathcal{T}_i = (\mathcal{M}'_i, \mathcal{M}''_i, C_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, the tensor product $\mathcal{T}_1 \otimes \mathcal{T}_2$ is given by $(\mathcal{M}'_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}'_2, \mathcal{M}''_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}''_2, C_1 \otimes C_2)$. The direct sum is also naturally defined.

Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', C)$ be a perfect strict $\mathcal{R}$-triple. The pairing C induces the perfect pairing $C' : \mathcal{M}'^{\vee}(\boldsymbol{A}) \otimes \mathcal{M}''^{\vee}(\boldsymbol{A}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$. Then we obtain the dual $\mathcal{T}^{\vee} = (\mathcal{M}'^{\vee}, \mathcal{M}''^{\vee}, C')$.

Lemma 3.95 Θ *preserves tensor products, duals and direct sums.*

We have Sabbah's hermitian adjoint $\mathcal{T}^* = (\mathcal{M}'', \mathcal{M}', C^*)$ in the category of $\mathcal{R}$-triples ([42]). The hermitian adjoint in the category of vector bundles over $\mathbb{P}^1$ is given by $V^* := \sigma(V)^{\vee}$.

3.10.2 Tate objects

The $\mathcal{R}$-triple corresponding to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(p, q)$ is as follows:

$$\Theta(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(p,q)) = \Big(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(-p,-q)},\ \ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(p,q)}),\ \ C\Big).$$

Here the pairing C is given as follows:

$$C\big(f_0^{(-p,-q)}, \sigma(f_\infty^{(p,q)})\big) = \big(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\big)^{p+q}.$$

For simplicity, we denote it by $\big(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\big)^{p+q}$. In particular, if we forget the torus action, $\Theta(\mathcal{O}(n))$ is given as follows:

$$\Theta(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(n)) = \Big(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(-n)},\ \ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(n)}),\ \ \big(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\big)^n\Big).$$

The $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\Theta(\sigma(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(n)))$ is given by $\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(n)}),\ \ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(-n)},\ \ (-1)^n \cdot \big(\sqrt{-1}\lambda\big)^n\Big)$. The latter is same as the hermitian adjoint $\Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)^*$ in the category of $\mathcal{R}$-triples. Hence the isomorphism $\sigma^*\mathcal{O}(-n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-n)$ (the subsubsection 3.3.2) induces the isomorphism $\Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(n)\big)^* \longrightarrow \Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)$.

Lemma 3.96 *The induced isomorphism* $\Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(n)\big)^* \longrightarrow \Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)$ *is given by the pair of the maps* (φ_1, φ_2)*:*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(n)}\big) \xleftarrow{\varphi_1} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(n)}, \qquad \varphi_1(f_0^{(n)}) = \sqrt{-1}^n \sigma(f_\infty^{(n)}),$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(-n)} \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(-n)}\big), \quad \varphi_2\big(f_0^{(-n)}\big) = \sqrt{-1}^n \sigma\big(f_\infty^{(-n)}\big).$$

Proof The morphism φ_1 is the dual of the isomorphism $\iota_{-n} : \sigma\big(\mathcal{O}(-n)_\infty\big) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-n)_0$. The morphism φ_2 is given by $\sigma(\iota_{-n})$. Then the claim can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

For any half integers $k \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, we put $\mathbb{T}^s(k) := \Big(\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_0^{(2k)},\ \ \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_\infty^{(2k)},\ \ (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2k}\Big)$, which is the Tate object in the category of $\mathcal{R}$-triples, namely, the Tate twist in the category of $\mathcal{R}$-triple is given by the tensor product with $\mathbb{T}^s(k)$. Recall that the canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{T}^s(k) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^s(-k)^*$ is given by the pair of maps $\big((-1)^{2k}, 1\big)$ (see the section 1.6.a in [42]).

We fix the complex number a such that $a^2 = \sqrt{-1}$. Then we take the isomorphism $\Phi^n = (\Phi_1^{(n)}, \Phi_2^{(n)}) : \Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(n)\big) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^s(-n/2)$ given as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot f_0^{(-n)} \xleftarrow{\Phi_1^{(n)}} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_0^{(-n)}, \qquad \Phi_1(e_0^{(-n)}) = a^n \cdot f_0^{(-n)},$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{\Phi_2^{(n)}} \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_\infty^{(-n)}, \quad \Phi_2(f_\infty^{(n)}) = a^{-n} \cdot e_\infty^{(-n)}.$$

In particular, the isomorphism $\Theta(\mathbb{T}(n)) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^S(n)$ is given by the pair $\big(\Phi_1^{(-2n)}, \Phi_2^{(-2n)}\big)$:

$$\Phi_1^{(-2n)}(e_0^{(2n)}) = (\sqrt{-1})^n \cdot t_0^{(-n)}, \qquad \Phi_2^{(-2n)}\big(\sigma(t_\infty^{(n)})\big) = (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot e_\infty^{(2n)}.$$

Lemma 3.97 *The following diagramm is commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(n)\big)^* \arrow[r] & \Theta\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big) \arrow[d] \\
\mathbb{T}^s(-n/2)^* \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & \mathbb{T}^s(n/2).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{66}$$

Proof We have the following diagramms:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}\cdot\sigma(f_\infty^{(n)}) \arrow[d, "a^{-n}"] & \mathcal{O}\cdot f_0^{(n)} \arrow[l, "(\sqrt{-1})^n"'] & \mathcal{O}\cdot f_0^{(-n)} \arrow[r, "(\sqrt{-1})^n"] & \mathcal{O}\cdot\sigma\big(f_\infty^{(-n)}\big) \arrow[d, "a^n"] \\
\mathcal{O}\cdot e_\infty^{(-n)} & \mathcal{O}\cdot e_0^{(n)}, \arrow[l, "(-1)^n"'] \arrow[u, "a^{-n}"] & \mathcal{O}\cdot e_0^{(-n)} \arrow[r, "1"] \arrow[u, "a^n"'] & \mathcal{O}\cdot e_\infty^{(n)}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{67}$$

Since we have $a^{-2n}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^n=(-1)^n$ and $a^{2n}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^n=1$ due to our choice of a, we obtain the commutativity of the diagramms in (67) and thus the commutativity of the diagramm (66). ▮

Lemma 3.98 *The functor Θ essentially commutes with Tate twists of the both categories. The functor Θ preserves the compatibility of the Tate twist and the adjunction.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 3.97. ▮

Recall that we have the canonical isomorphism $\Theta\big(\sigma(V^\vee)\big)\simeq\Theta(V)^*$.

Corollary 3.17 *The pairing $S: V\otimes\sigma^*(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ is a polarization of pure twistor structure of weight n if and only if the induced morphism $S:\Theta(V)\longrightarrow\Theta(V)^*\otimes\mathbb{T}^S(-n)$ is a polarization of pure twistor $\mathcal{R}$-triple of weight n in 0-dimension.*

Proof In the case $n=0$, it is clear. Since Θ is compatible with the Tate twist, we can reduce the problem to the case $n=0$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& S: V\otimes\sigma^*(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n) \text{ is a polarization} \\
\iff\quad & S(-n):\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)\otimes\sigma^*\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0) \text{ is a polarization} \\
\iff\quad & \Theta\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)\longrightarrow\Theta\big(V\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-n)\big)^* \text{ is a polarization.} \\
\iff\quad & \Theta(V)\otimes\mathbb{T}(n/2)\longrightarrow\big(\Theta(V)\otimes\mathbb{T}(n/2)\big)^* \text{ is a polarization.} \\
\iff\quad & \Theta(V)\longrightarrow\Theta(V)^*\otimes\mathbb{T}^S(-n) \text{ is a polarization.}
\end{aligned}$$

▮

Definition 3.16 *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a strict perfect $\mathcal{R}$-triple in 0-dimension, W be a filtration of $\mathcal{T}$, and $\boldsymbol{N}$ be a tuple of nilpotent morphisms $N_i:\mathcal{T}\longrightarrow\mathcal{T}\otimes\mathbb{T}^S(-1)$ $(i=1,\dots,l)$. Let S be a hermitian duality of $\mathcal{T}$ of weight n. The tuple $(\mathcal{T},W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ is called a Pol-MTS of type (n,l) in the sense of Sabbah, if it is isomorphic to $\Theta(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ for some Pol-MTS $(V,W,\boldsymbol{N},S)$ of type (n,l).* ▮

3.10.3 The induced polarized pure twistor

Let V be a pure twistor of weight n and $S: V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ be a polarization, which induces the pairing $\sigma(S):\sigma(V)\otimes V\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$. Then we obtain the isomorphism $\rho_S:\sigma(V)\longrightarrow V^\vee\otimes\mathbb{T}(-n)$, and we have the induced polarization $(\rho_S',\rho_S''):\Theta\big(\sigma(V)\big)\longrightarrow\Theta\big(\sigma(V)\big)^*\otimes\mathbb{T}^S(-n)$. We can naturally regarded ρ_S' and ρ_S'' as morphisms $V_0\longrightarrow\sigma\big(V_\infty^\vee\big)$. Let $C': V_0(\boldsymbol{A})\otimes\overline{V_0(\boldsymbol{A})}\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$ be the sesqui-linear pairing given as follows:

$$C'(u,\bar v):=C_{\sigma(V)}\big(\rho_S''(u),\bar v\big).$$

Then we obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple (V_0, V_0, C'), and recall that the morphism $\big((-1)^n, 1\big) : (V_0, V_0, C') \longrightarrow (V_0, V_0, C') \otimes \mathbb{T}^S(-n)$ gives the polarization.

Let us calculate the pairing C'. First we consider the case $V = \mathcal{O}(n)$. We denote the pairing of V by S. The pairing $\sigma(S)$ gives the correspondence $\sigma(f_0^{(n)}) \otimes f_\infty^{(n)} \longmapsto (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot t_\infty^{(-n)}$. Thus we have $\rho_S(\sigma(f_0^{(n)})) = (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot f_\infty^{(-n)} \otimes t_\infty^{(-n)}$. Hence we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho''_S(f_0^{(n)}) = \sigma\big(\rho_S(\sigma(f_0^{(n)}))\big) &= (\sqrt{-1})^n \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)}) \otimes \sigma(t_\infty^{(-n)}) \\ &\longmapsto (\sqrt{-1})^n \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)}) \cdot (\sqrt{-1})^n \cdot e_\infty^{(-2n)} = (-1)^n \cdot \sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)}) \cdot e_\infty^{(-2n)}. \qquad (68)\end{aligned}$$

Then the pairing $C' : \mathcal{O}(n)_0(\boldsymbol{A}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(n)_0(\boldsymbol{A}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}C'\big(f_0^{(n)} \otimes \overline{f_0^{(n)}}\big) = C_{\sigma(\mathcal{O}(n))}\big(\sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)}) \cdot (-1)^n, \overline{f_0^{(n)}}\big) &= (-1)^n \cdot \big\langle \sigma(f_\infty^{(-n)}), \sigma(f_0^{(n)}) \big\rangle = (-1)^n \cdot \sigma^* \big\langle f_\infty^{(-n)}, f_0^{(n)} \big\rangle \\ &= (-1)^n \cdot \sigma^*\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-n}\big) = (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^n. \qquad (69)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have the following:

$$S\big(f_0^{(n)}, \sigma(f_0^{(n)})\big) = S\big(f_0^{(n)}, \sigma\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-n} \cdot f_\infty^{(n)}\big)\big) = (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^n \cdot (-1)^n \cdot (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot t_0^{(-n)} = (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^n \cdot (\sqrt{-1})^n \cdot t_0^{(-n)}.$$

Hence we have the following formula:

$$C'\big(f_0^{(n)}, \overline{f_0^{(n)}}\big) \cdot t_0^{(-n)} = (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot S\big(f_0^{(n)}, \sigma^*(f_0^{(n)})\big).$$

Lemma 3.99 *Let (V, S) be a polarized pure twistor of weight n. Then the $\mathcal{R}$-triple (V_0, V_0, C') is a pure twistor of weight n, where the sesqui-linear pairing C' is given as follows:*

$$C'(u, \overline{v}) \cdot t_0^{(-n)} = (\sqrt{-1})^{-n} \cdot S(u \otimes \sigma^*(v)).$$

Proof Since any polarized pure twistor of weight n is isomorphic to a direct sum of $(\mathcal{O}(n), S)$, we can reduce the lemma to the case $V = \mathcal{O}(n)$. It has been already shown above. ∎

3.10.4 A lemma

Let $(V, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ be a Pol-MTS of type $(0, l)$. Recall that we obtain the Pol-MTS $(\mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}(V), W, \tilde{\boldsymbol{N}}, \mathcal{V}_I(S))$ of type $(1-l, l+1)$, and we obtain the Pol-MTS $(P_k \operatorname{Gr}_k^{W(N)} \mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}(V), W, \boldsymbol{N}, S_k)$ of type $(1-l+k, l)$. We have the subbundle $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \subset P_k \operatorname{Gr}_k^{W(N)} \mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}(V)$, which is pure twistor of weight $1-l+k$. Moreover S_k induces the polarization of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}}$. (See the subsubsection 3.9.2 and the subsubsection 3.9.5). Hence we obtain the pure twistor $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \otimes \mathcal{O}(l-1)$ and the polarization of weight k.

We put $\big(\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \otimes \mathcal{O}(l-1)\big)_0 := \big(\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \otimes \mathcal{O}(l-1)\big)_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$. Due to the result in the subsubsection 3.10.3, we obtain the pure twistor $\big((\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \otimes \mathcal{O}(l-1))_0, (\mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}} \otimes \mathcal{O}(l-1))_0, C'\big)$. Let us calculate the sesqui-linear pairing C'. The endomorphism $\bar{N}_a \in \operatorname{End}(V_0, V_0)$ is determined by $N_a = \bar{N}_a \cdot t_0^{(-1)}$.

We have the following:

$$\mathcal{V}_l(V)_0 = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} V_0 \otimes t_0^{(i)} \cdot N^i \Big/ \prod_{a=1}^{l} (N - N_a).$$

For any $u_i, v_j \in V(\boldsymbol{A})$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}S'\big(u_i \cdot t_0^{(i)} \cdot N^{i+k}, \sigma\big(v_j \cdot t_0^{(j)} \cdot N^j\big)\big) &= (-1)^j \cdot S\big(u_i, \sigma(v_j)\big) \cdot (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2j} \cdot (-1)^j \cdot t_0^{(i+j+k)} \\ &= S\big(u_i, \sigma(v_j)\big) \cdot (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2j} \cdot t_0^{(i+j+k)}. \qquad (70)\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used $\sigma(t_0^{(j)}) = \sigma\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{2j}\cdot t_\infty^{(j)}\big) = (\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2j}\cdot(-1)^j\cdot t_0^{(j)}$. Then we have the following:

$$S'\big(\tilde{N}_{\underline{l}}^{-1}\big(u_i\cdot N^{i+k}\cdot t_0^{(i)}\big),\sigma\big(v_j\cdot t_0^{(j)}\cdot N^j\big)\big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}(-1)^j\cdot N^{-l-|\boldsymbol{n}|+i+j+k} S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{l} N_a^{n_a}u_i\otimes t_0^{(i)},\sigma\big(v_j\cdot t_0^{(j)}\big)\Big)$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2j}\cdot N^{-l-|\boldsymbol{n}|+i+j+k}\cdot S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{l}\bar{N}_a^{n_a}\cdot u_i,\sigma(v_j)\Big)\cdot t_0^{(-|\boldsymbol{n}|+i+j)}. \quad (71)$$

Hence we obtain the following:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}(S)\big(u_i\cdot t_0^{(i)}\cdot N^{i+k},\sigma\big(v_j\cdot t_0^{(j)}\cdot N^j\big)\big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S(k)}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-2j}\cdot S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{n}\bar{N}_a^{n_a}\cdot u_i,\sigma(v_j)\Big)\cdot t_0^{(l-1-k)}.$$

Here we put $S(k) := \big\{\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^l,\ \big|\ -|\boldsymbol{n}|-l+i+j+k=-1\big\}$.

Lemma 3.100 *When we twist by $\mathcal{O}(l-1)$, we have the following:*

$$\mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}(S)\Big(u_i\cdot t_0^{(i)}\cdot N^{i+k}\cdot f_0^{(l-1)},\ \sigma\big(v_j\cdot t_0^{(j)}\cdot N^j\cdot f_0^{(l-1)}\big)\Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S(k)}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{l-1-2j}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^{l-1}\cdot S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{l}N_a^{n_a}\cdot u_i,\sigma(v_j)\Big)\cdot t_0^{(-k)}.$$

Proof We have used the following correspondence for the canonical polarization of $\mathcal{O}(n-1)$:

$$f_0^{(l-1)}\otimes\sigma\big(f_0^{(l-1)}\big) = f_0^{(l-1)}\otimes\sigma\big((\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{-l+1}\cdot f_\infty^{(l-1)}\big)\longmapsto$$
$$(-1)^{-l+1}\cdot(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{l-1}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^{-l+1} = (\sqrt{-1})^{l-1}\cdot(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{l-1}. \quad (72)$$

∎

Then we obtain the following formula:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\underline{l}}S\Big(u_i\cdot t_0^{(i)}\cdot(-\sqrt{-1}N)^i\cdot N^k\cdot f_0^{(l-1)},\ \sigma\big(v_j\cdot t_0^{(j)}\cdot(\sqrt{-1}N)^j\cdot f_0^{(l-1)}\big)\Big)$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S(k)}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{l-1-2j}\cdot\sqrt{-1}^{\,k}\cdot S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{l}(-\sqrt{-1}\bar{N}_a)\cdot u_i,\sigma(v_j)\Big)\cdot t_0^{(-k)}. \quad (73)$$

Hence we obtain the following.

Lemma 3.101 *We put $Y := \mathcal{C}_{\underline{l}}\otimes\mathcal{O}(l-1)$. Then the $\mathcal{R}$-triple (Y_0, Y_0, C') is pure twistor of weight k. Here C' is given by the following:*

$$C'\big(u_i\cdot(-\sqrt{-1}N)^i,\overline{v\cdot(\sqrt{-1}N)^j}\big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in S(k)}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{l-1-2j}\cdot S\Big(\prod_{a=1}^{l}(-\sqrt{-1}\bar{N}_a)^{n_a}\cdot u_i,\sigma(v_j)\Big)$$

Proof We have only to apply Lemma 3.99. ∎

4 Preliminary for filtrations

4.1 Filtrations and decompositions on a vector space

4.1.1 Filtration

Let k be a field. Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over k.

Definition 4.1 *An increasing filtration F of V indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}$ is defined to be a family of subspaces $\bigl\{F_\eta \subset V \bigm| \eta \in \boldsymbol{R}\bigr\}$ satisfying the conditions $F_\eta \subset F_{\eta'}$ $(\eta \leq \eta')$ and $F_\eta = V$ for any sufficiently large η. In this paper, we mainly use the increasing filtration. So 'filtration' will mean 'increasing filtration' if we do not mention.* ▮

When we consider a tuple of filtrations, we often use the notation $\boldsymbol{F} = ({}^iF \,|\, i \in I)$. We also use the notation ${}^i\operatorname{Gr}^F$ to denote the associated graded vector space $\operatorname{Gr}^{{}^iF}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{F} := \bigl({}^iF \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a tuple of filtrations indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}$. For any subset $J \subset I$ and for any $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J$, we put as follows:

$$ {}^JF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \bigcap_{j \in J} {}^jF_{\eta_j}. $$

Definition 4.2 *$\boldsymbol{F} := \bigl({}^iF \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a tuple of filtrations indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}$. It is called compatible, if we have a decomposition of $V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I} U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ satisfying the following:*

$$ {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l, \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\rho}} U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}. \tag{74} $$

If $\boldsymbol{F}$ is compatible, a decomposition of V satisfying (74) is called a splitting of $\boldsymbol{F}$. ▮

Recall that $\boldsymbol{F} = ({}^iF \,|\, i \in I)$ is called sequentially compatible if the following is satisfied:

- We have the induced filtrations ${}^iF^{(1)}$ $(i = 2, \ldots, l)$ on ${}^1\operatorname{Gr}^F$. Then ${}^iF^{(1)}$ are sequentially compatible.
- The following map is surjective:

$$ \bigcap_{i=1}^{l} {}^iF_{h_i} \longrightarrow {}^1\operatorname{Gr}^F_{h_1} \cap \bigcap_{i=2}^{l} {}^iF^{(1)}_{h_i}. $$

Lemma 4.1 *Compatibility and sequential compatibility are equivalent.*

Proof We saw that sequential compatibility implies compatibility in our previous paper [38]. It is easy to see that compatibility implies sequential compatibility. ▮

Notation Let $\boldsymbol{F} = ({}^iF \,|\, i \in I)$ be a tuple of filtrations. For any subset $J \subset I$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J$, we put as follows:

$$ {}^J\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(V) := \frac{{}^JF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\eta}' \lneq \boldsymbol{\eta}} {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}'}}. $$

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\boldsymbol{F} = ({}^iF \bigm| i \in I)$ be a tuple of filtrations on V. Then we have the following inequality:*

$$ \sum_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \dim {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \geq \dim V. $$

If the equality holds, then the filtrations ${}^iF$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ are compatible.

Proof We have the surjection $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} : {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \longrightarrow {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. We pick subspace $U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \subset {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ such that the restriction of $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ to $U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ gives the isomorphism of $U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. Then we have the naturally defined surjection $f : \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \longrightarrow V$. It implies the inequality. If the equality holds, then f is isomorphic, and thus the decomposition $V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ gives a splitting of the filtrations. ▮

4.1.2 Decomposition

Let k be a field. Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over k.

Definition 4.3 *A decomposition $\boldsymbol{E}$ of V indexed by a set S is defined to be a family of subspaces $\bigl\{\mathbb{E}_\alpha \subset V \bigm| \alpha \in S\bigr\}$ such that $V = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in S} \mathbb{E}_\alpha$.* ▮

When we consider a tuple of decompositions, we often use the notation $\boldsymbol{E} = \bigl({}^{i}\mathbb{E} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$. For any subset $J \subset I$ and for any $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \boldsymbol{C}^{J}$, we put as follows:

$$
{}^{J}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} := \bigcap_{j \in J} {}^{j}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j}.
$$

Definition 4.4 *Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \bigl({}^{i}\mathbb{E} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a tuple of decompositions indexed by a set S. It is called compatible, if the following holds:*

$$
V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in S^{I}} {}^{I}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}.
$$

▮

4.1.3 Filtrations and decompositions

Let V be a vector space over k.

Definition 4.5 *Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \bigl({}^{i}\mathbb{E} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a tuple of decompositions of V. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \bigl({}^{j}F \bigm| j \in J\bigr)$ be a tuple of filtrations of F. Then the tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F})$ is called compatible, if the following holds:*

- *The tuple $\boldsymbol{E}$ of decompositions is compatible.*
- *The tuple $\boldsymbol{F}$ of the filtrations is compatible, in the sense of Definition 4.2.*
- *We have ${}^{j}F = \bigoplus \bigl({}^{i}F_{b} \cap {}^{I}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\bigr)$.* ▮

Let J_1 be a subset of J and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{J_1}$. The filtrations ${}^{i}F$ $(i \not\in J_1)$ induce the filtration on ${}^{J}\operatorname{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. We denote the induced filtration by ${}^{i}F^{J_1}$. Similarly, we use the notation ${}^{J_2}F^{J_1}$ and ${}^{I}\mathbb{E}^{J_1}$. We use the notation $\boldsymbol{F}^{J_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{E}^{J_1}$ to denote the induced tuples $\bigl({}^{j}F^{J_1} \bigm| j \in J - J_1\bigr)$ and $\bigl({}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{J_1} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$.

4.2 Filtrations and decompositions on a vector bundle

4.2.1 Filtrations on a vector bundle

Let X be a complex manifold or scheme equipped with an action of a finite group G. Let V be a G-equivariant vector bundle.

Definition 4.6

- *A G-filtration F of V indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}$ in the category of G-equivariant vector bundles is defined to be a family of G-equivariant subbundles $\bigl\{F_{\eta} \subset V \bigm| \eta \in \boldsymbol{R}\bigr\}$ satisfying the conditions $F_{\eta} \subset F_{\eta'}$ $(\eta \leq \eta')$ and $F_{\eta} = V$ for any sufficiently large η.*
- *A G-decomposition $\mathbb{E}$ of V indexed by $\boldsymbol{C}$ in the category of G-equivariant vector bundles is defined to be a family of G-equivariant subbundles $\bigl\{\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} \bigm| \alpha \in \boldsymbol{C}\bigr\}$ such that $V = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C}} \mathbb{E}_{\alpha}$.* ▮

We often omit to denote “G-”, if there are any confusion.

Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \bigl({}^{i}F \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a tuple of G-filtrations of V. Let P be a point of X. Then we obtain the tuple of filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}F_{|P} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ of the vector space $V_{|P}$. We denote the tuple by $\boldsymbol{F}_{|P}$. Similarly, we use the notation $\boldsymbol{E}_{|P}$ to denote the restriction of $\boldsymbol{E}$ to the fibers $V_{|P}$.

Definition 4.7 *Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \bigl\{{}^{i}\mathbb{E} \bigm| i \in I\bigr\}$ be a tuple of G-decompositions of V. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \bigl\{{}^{j}F \bigm| j \in J\bigr\}$ be a tuple of G-filtrations of V. The tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F})$ is called compatible, if the following holds:*

- *For any point $P \in X$, the tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}_{|P}, \boldsymbol{F}_{|P})$ is compatible in the sense of Definition 4.5.*

- *Let I_1 and J_1 be subsets of I and J respectively. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^{J_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}^{I_1}$. Then $\Big\{ {}^{J_1}F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,P} \cap {}^{I_1}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,|\,P} \,\Big|\, P \in X \Big\}$ forms a vector bundle over X.* ∎

The second condition can be reworded as follows:

Lemma 4.3 *We put as follows:*

$$\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta},P) := \dim\Big({}^{J_1}F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,P} \cap {}^{I_1}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,|\,P} \Big).$$

Then $\Big\{ {}^{J_1}F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,P} \cap {}^{I_1}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,|\,P} \,\Big|\, P \in X \Big\}$ forms a vector bundle over X, if and only if the numbers $\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta},P)$ are independent of a choice of $P \in X$. ∎

Remark 4.1 *We put as follows:*

$$d(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta},P) := \dim\Big({}^{J}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,P} \cap {}^{I}\mathbb{E}^J_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,|\,P} \Big).$$

If the tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}_{|P}, \boldsymbol{F}_{|P})$ is compatible, the family of the numbers $\big\{ d(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta},P) \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \boldsymbol{C}^I,\ \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J \big\}$ can be reconstructed from the family of the numbers $\big\{ \bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta},P) \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \boldsymbol{C}^I,\ \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J \big\}$. Hence if $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible, we obtain the vector bundle ${}^{J}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \cap {}^{I}\mathbb{E}^J_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ on X.

Such an argument will be used in many times without mention. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in I \big)$ be a tuple of G-decompositions of V, and let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^jF \,\big|\, j \in J \big)$ be a tuple of G-filtrations of V. For any subset $I_1 \subset I$, we denote the tuple $\big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in I_1 \big)$ by $q_{I_1}(\boldsymbol{E})$. We also use the notation $q_{J_1}(\boldsymbol{F})$ for any subset $J_1 \subset J$.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $\boldsymbol{E}$, $\boldsymbol{F}$ be as above. Assume that $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible. Then $(q_{I_1}(\boldsymbol{E}), q_{J_1}(\boldsymbol{F}))$ is compatible for any subsets $I_1 \subset I$ and $J_1 \subset J$.* ∎

Definition 4.8 *Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in I \big)$ be a tuple of G-decompositions of V, and let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^jF \,\big|\, j \in J \big)$ be a tuple of G-filtrations of V. Assume that $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible. A decomposition $V = \bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \in \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \boldsymbol{C}^I} U_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha})}$ is called a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$, if the following holds for any $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \in \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \boldsymbol{C}^I$:*

$$ {}^JF_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap {}^I\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b} \le \boldsymbol{a}} U_{(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{\alpha})}.$$

∎

4.2.2 Compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$

Let V be a G-equivariant vector bundle over X. Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^s\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, s \in S \big)$ be a compatible tuple of G-decompositions of V. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l} \big)$ be a compatible tuple of G-filtrations of V. Let m be an integer such that $1 \le m \le l$. For any element $(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^m$, we have the G-vector bundle ${}^{\underline{m}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \cap {}^S\mathbb{E}^{\underline{m}}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.

Let l_1 be an integer such that $1 \le l_1 \le l$. Let us consider a tuple $\boldsymbol{W} = \big(W(\underline{m}) \,\big|\, m \in \underline{l_1} \big)$ such that each $W(\underline{m})$ is a G-filtration of ${}^{\underline{m}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$ which is compatible with the tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}^{\underline{m}}, \boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{m}})$. (See the subsubsection 4.1.3 for $\boldsymbol{E}^{\underline{m}}$ and $\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{m}}$). In that case, the filtrations $W(\underline{i})$ $(i \le m)$ induce the filtrations on ${}^{\underline{m}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ for any $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^m$. We denote the induced filtrations by $W^{\underline{m}}(\underline{i})$. We denote the tuple $\big(W^{\underline{m}}(\underline{i}) \,\big|\, i \le m \big)$ by $\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{m}}$.

Definition 4.9 *Let V, $\boldsymbol{E}$, $\boldsymbol{F}$, l_1 and $\boldsymbol{W}$ be as above. The tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$ is called compatible if $(\boldsymbol{E}^{\underline{m}}, \boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{m}}, \boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{m}})$ is compatible for any $m \le l$, in the sense of Definition* 4.7. ∎

Let J be a subset of $\underline{l}$. Let $m(J)$ denote the number determined by the conditions $\underline{m(J)} \subset J \cap \underline{l_1}$ and $m(J)+1 \notin J \cap \underline{l_1}$. We put $q_J(\boldsymbol{W}) := \big(W(\underline{i}) \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, m(J) \big)$. Then the following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 4.5 *Let S' and J be subsets of S and I. Then we obtain the tuple $\big(q_{S'}(\boldsymbol{E}), q_J(\boldsymbol{F}), q_J(\boldsymbol{W}) \big)$. It is compatible.* ∎

4.2.3 Splitting of $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$

Let l' be any integer such that $1 \leq l' \leq l$, and we put $l_1' := \min\{l', l_1\}$. We have the projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$, taking the first l'-components. Then we obtain the projection $\pi_1 : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$. We also have the projection $\pi_3 : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1'} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$.

On the other hand, we have the projection $\mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{l_1'}$, taking the first l_1'-components. Then we obtain the projection $\pi_2 : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1'}$. Note we have $\pi_1 = \pi_3 \circ \pi_2$.

Let us consider a G-equivariant decomposition of V:

$$V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}} U_{\boldsymbol{u}}. \tag{75}$$

For elements $\boldsymbol{v} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_1 \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1'}$, we put as follows:

$${}^{l'}C_{\boldsymbol{v}} := \bigoplus_{\pi_1(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{v}} U_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \quad {}^{l_1'}B_{\boldsymbol{u}_1} := \bigoplus_{\pi_2(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{u}_1} U_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Then we have the following:

$${}^{l'}C_{\boldsymbol{v}} = \bigoplus_{\pi_3(\boldsymbol{u}_1) = \boldsymbol{v}} {}^{l_1'}B_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}.$$

Definition 4.10 *Assume that* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ *is compatible. The decomposition* (75) *is called a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$*, if the following holds:*

1. *The decomposition* $V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}} {}^{l'}C_{\boldsymbol{v}}$ *is a splitting of the tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E}, q_{\underline{l}'}(\boldsymbol{F}))$ *for any* l'*, in the sense of Definition* 4.8.
2. *For any element* $\boldsymbol{v} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{a}) \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$*, we obtain the following decomposition via the isomorphism* ${}^{\underline{l}'}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap {}^S\mathbb{E}^{\underline{l}'}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \simeq {}^{l'}C_{\boldsymbol{v}}$ *given by the previous condition:*
$${}^{\underline{l}'}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap {}^S\mathbb{E}^{\underline{l}'}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \simeq \bigoplus_{\pi_3(\boldsymbol{u}_1) = \boldsymbol{v}} {}^{l_1'}B_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}. \tag{76}$$
Then the decomposition (76) *is a splitting of the tuple* $(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l}'}, \boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l}'})$ *in the sense of Definition* 4.8.

We also say that $\big(U_{\boldsymbol{u}} \,|\, \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\big)$ *is a splitting.* ▮

Let $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ be a compatible tuple, and let $\big(U_{\boldsymbol{u}} \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\big)$ be a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$. Let S' and J be subsets of S and I respectively. We have the naturally defined projection:

$$q_{S',J} : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^{S'} \times \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(J)}.$$

Then we put as follows, for any element $\boldsymbol{u}_1 \in \boldsymbol{C}^{S'} \times \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(J)}$:

$$U'_{\boldsymbol{u}_1} := \bigoplus_{q_{S',J}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{u}_1} U_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 4.6 *The decomposition* $\big(U'_{\boldsymbol{u}_1} \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{u}_1 \in \boldsymbol{C}^{S'} \times \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(J)}\big)$ *gives a splitting of the compatible tuple* $\big(q_S(\boldsymbol{E}), q_J(\boldsymbol{F}), q_J(\boldsymbol{W})\big)$. ▮

4.3 Compatibility of the filtrations and nilpotent maps

4.3.1 A lemma

Let V be a vector space over k.

Lemma 4.7 *Let F be a filtration on V, and N be a nilpotent map on V preserving the filtration F. On the associated graded vector space $\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$, we have the induced filtration $W^F(N)$ and the induced nilpotent map N^F. Assume $W(N^F) = W^F(N)$.*

Then the induced filtration $F^{(1)}$ and the primitive decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}$ are compatible.

Proof Let us consider the induced isomorphism:

$$N^h : \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^{W(N)}. \tag{77}$$

It preserves the filtration $F^{(1)}$. First of all, we would like to show that the morphism (77) is strict with respect to the filtration $F^{(1)}$.

Since the isomorphism (77) preserves the filtration, the equality $\dim F_a^{(1)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)} = \dim F_a^{(1)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^{W(N)}$ implies the strictness of (77). So we have only to show the equality. For that purpose, we have only to show the following equality for any a and any h:

$$\dim \mathrm{Gr}_a^{F^{(1)}} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigr) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}_a^{F^{(1)}} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^{W(N)}\bigr). \tag{78}$$

Note we have the following equalities for any a and h:

$$\dim \mathrm{Gr}_a^{F^{(1)}} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\bigr) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W^F(N)} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_a^F\bigr) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N^F)} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_a^F\bigr). \tag{79}$$

By definition of the weight filtrations, we have the following equality:

$$\dim \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N^F)} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_a^F\bigr) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^{W(N^F)} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_a^F\bigr). \tag{80}$$

From (79) and (80), we obtain the equality (78). Thus we obtain the strictness of the morphism of (77).

Recall that the primitive part is given as follows:

$$P_h \,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)} = \mathrm{Ker}(N^{h+1} : \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{-h-2}^{W(N)}),$$

We put $P_h \,\mathrm{Gr}_{h-2a}^{W(N)} = N^a P_h \,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}$ for any $0 \leq a \leq 2h$, and then we have the decomposition.

$$\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)} = \bigoplus_{a \geq 0} P_{|h|+2a} \,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}.$$

Let x be an element of $F_b^{(1)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}$. We have the primitive decomposition $x = \sum x_a$, where $x_a \in P_{|h|+2a} \,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}$. We would like to show each element x_a is contained in $F_b^{(1)}$.

Since the isomorphism (77) is strict, we have only to consider the case $h \geq 0$. We assume that $\bigl\{a \bigm| x_a \not\in F_b^{(1)}\bigr\}$, and we will derive the contradiction. We put $a_0 := \max\bigl\{a \bigm| x_a \not\in F_b^{(1)}\bigr\}$. We may assume that $x = \sum_{a \leq a_0} x_a$. Then we have the following:

$$N^{h+a_0} x = N^{h+a_0} x_{a_0} \in F_b^{(1)}.$$

Due to the strictness of (77), there exists the element $y \in F_b^{(1)} \cap \mathrm{Gr}_{h+2a_0}^{W(N)}$ such that $N^{h+2a_0} y = N^{h+a_0} x_{a_0}$. Due to the property of the primitive decomposition, we have the equality $N^{a_0} y = x_{a_0} \in F_b^{(1)}$, which contradicts $x_{a_0} \not\in F_b^{(1)}$. Thus we are done. ∎

4.3.2 Sequential compatibility

Definition 4.11 *Let V be a finite dimensional vector space. Let $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m$ be commuting tuple of nilpotent maps of V. Let ${}^1F, \dots, {}^lF$ be filtrations on V. $(\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m; {}^1F, \dots, {}^lF)$ is called sequentially compatible, if the following conditions hold:*

1. *$\mathcal{N}_j$ preserves the filtration ${}^iF$.*
2. *We put $\mathcal{N}(\underline{j}) := \sum_{i \leq j} \mathcal{N}_i$. We denote the weight filtration of $\mathcal{N}(\underline{j})$ by $W(\underline{j})$. Then the filtrations $(W(\underline{1}), W(\underline{2}), \dots, W(\underline{m}), {}^1F, \dots, {}^lF)$ are compatible, in the sense of Definition* 4.2.
3. *On the associated graded vector spaces ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ $(\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I)$, we have the induced filtrations ${}^IW(\underline{j})$ and the induced nilpotent maps ${}^I\mathcal{N}(\underline{j})$. Then we have $W({}^I\mathcal{N}(\underline{j})) = {}^IW(\underline{j})$.*
4. *On the associated graded vector spaces ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ $(\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I)$, the tuple of nilpotent maps ${}^I\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, {}^I\mathcal{N}_m$ are sequentially compatible (see Definition* 2.7 *in* [38]*).* ▮

Lemma 4.8 *Assume a tuple $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m, {}^1F, \dots, {}^lF)$ is sequentially compatible.*

(A) *The induced tuple $\mathcal{S}(I) := \big({}^I\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, {}^I\mathcal{N}_m, {}^iF\ (i \in I^c)\big)$ on ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F$ is sequentially compatible.*

(B) *The induced tuple $\mathcal{S}^{(1)} := \big(\mathcal{N}_2^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m^{(1)}, {}^iF\ \ (i \in \underline{l})\big)$ on $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(\underline{1})}$ is sequentially compatible. Moreover, it is compatible with the primitive decomposition of* $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(\underline{1})}$.

Proof First we see the claim (A). The conditions 1, 3 and 4 in Definition 4.11 are clear. The condition 2 and 3 for $\mathcal{S}$ implies the condition 2 for $\mathcal{S}(I)$.

Let us show the claim (B). The condition 1 is clear. Note that we have $W(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}(\underline{j}))_h = W^{(1)}(\underline{j})_{h+a}$ on $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(\underline{1})}_a$ due to the condition 4 for $\mathcal{S}$. Then the condition 2 for $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ follows from the same condition for $\mathcal{S}$. We have the following on $\operatorname{Gr}^{W^F(\underline{1})}_a {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F \simeq {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{F^{(1)}} \operatorname{Gr}^{W(\underline{1})}$:

$$ {}^IW(\underline{j})^{(1)}_{h+a} = W\big({}^I\mathcal{N}^{(1)}(\underline{j})\big)_h. $$

Thus the conditions 3 and 4 for $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ follows from the conditions 2, 3 and 4 for $\mathcal{S}$.

The compatibility with the primitive decomposition follows from Lemma 4.7. ▮

Corollary 4.1 *Assume that a tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m, {}^1F, \dots, {}^lF)$ is sequentially compatible. Then the induced tuple $(\mathcal{N}_2^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m^{(1)}, {}^1F^{(1)}, \dots, {}^lF^{(1)})$ on the primitive part $P\operatorname{Gr}^{W(\underline{1})}$ is sequentially compatible.*

Proof It follows from the claim (B) in Lemma 4.8. ▮

Definition 4.12 *Let X be a complex manifold or scheme. Let V be a vector bundle over X. Let $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m$ be nilpotent maps on V. Let ${}^1F, \dots, {}^lF$ be filtrations of V in the category of vector bundles.*

A tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_m, {}^1F, \dots, {}^lF)$ is called sequentially compatible, if the following conditions hold:

1. *For any point $P \in X$, the tuple $(\mathcal{N}_{1\,|\,P}, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{m\,|\,P}, {}^1F_{|P}, \dots, {}^lF_{|P})$ is sequentially compatible, in the sense of Definition* 4.11.
2. *The family $\Big\{\bigcap_{j=1}^m W(\underline{j})_{h_j\,|\,P} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^l F_{a_i\,|\,P} \,\Big|\, P \in X\Big\}$ forms a vector bundle over X for each $(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{a})$.* ▮

4.3.3 Compatibility of the nilpotent maps defined on the associated graded bundles

Let V be a vector bundle over X. Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^s\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, s \in S\big)$ be a compatible tuple of the decompositions. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l}\big)$ be a compatible tuple of the filtrations. Let us consider a tuple of nilpotent maps $\boldsymbol{N} = (N_i)$, where N_i are defined on ${}^{\underline{i}}\operatorname{Gr}^F(V)$. In that case, we have the induced nilpotent maps $N_i^{\underline{m}}$ on ${}^{\underline{m}}\operatorname{Gr}^F$ for any $i \leq m$. We denote the tuple $(N_1^{\underline{m}}, \dots, N_m^{\underline{m}})$ by $\boldsymbol{N}^{\underline{m}}$.

Definition 4.13 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is called sequentially compatible, if the following holds:*

- N_i *preserves the decomposition* $\boldsymbol{E}^{\underline{i}}$.
- *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{N}^{\underline{m}},\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{m}})$ *on* ${}^{\underline{m}}\mathrm{Gr}^F$ *is sequentially compatible for any* $m\leq l$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.12. *(See the subsubsection* 4.1.3 *for* $\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{m}}$*.)* ▮

When we are given a compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$, we obtain the weight filtration $W(\underline{m})$ on ${}^{\underline{m}}\mathrm{Gr}^F$, and thus the tuple $\boldsymbol{W}=\big(W(\underline{m})\,\big|\,m\in\underline{l}\big)$. Hence we obtain the induced tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$ as in the subsubsection 4.2.2.

Lemma 4.9 *If* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.13, *then the induced tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$ *is compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.9.

Proof It immediately follows from the definition. ▮

Definition 4.14 *A splitting of a sequentially compatible tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is defined to be a splitting of the induced tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.10. ▮

4.3.4 Strongly sequential compatibility of nilpotent maps

Let V be a vector bundle on X. Let $\boldsymbol{E}=\big({}^s\mathbb{E}\,\big|\,s\in S\big)$ be a compatible tuple of G-decompositions. Let $\boldsymbol{N}=\big(N_i\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l\big)$ be a tuple of nilpotent maps of V.

Definition 4.15 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is called strongly sequentially compatible, if the following holds:*

- *Each nilpotent map* N_i *preserves the decompositions* ${}^sE$.
- *The tuple of nilpotent maps* $\boldsymbol{N}$ *is strongly sequentially compatible (see Definition* 2.9 *in* [38]*).* ▮

Definition 4.16 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$ *be a strongly sequentially compatible tuple. A splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is defined to be decompositions*

$$V=\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S,\\ \boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{Z}^m}}U_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}},\qquad U_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}=\bigoplus_{a\geq 0}P_{|q_1(\boldsymbol{h})|+2a}U_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}.$$

They are assumed to satisfy the following conditions:

- $\mathcal{N}(\underline{1})\big(P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}\big)=P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}}$.
- $\mathcal{N}(\underline{1})^{h+1}\big(P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}\big)=0$.
- $\mathcal{N}(\underline{1})^h:P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}\longrightarrow P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}-2h\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ *is isomorphic if* $q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=h\geq 0$.

Here we put $\boldsymbol{\delta}:=(1,\ldots,1)\in\mathbb{Z}^m$. ▮

For any subset $S'\subset S$, the tuple $\big({}^s\mathbb{E}\,\big|\,s\in S'\big)$ is denoted by $q_{S'}(\boldsymbol{E})$. For any integer m' such that $1\leq m'\leq m$, the tuple $(N_i\,|\,i=1,\ldots,m')$ is denoted by $q_{\underline{m'}}(\boldsymbol{N})$.

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 4.10

- *For any subset* $S'\subset S$ *and for any integer* m' *such that* $1\leq m'\leq m$, *the induced tuple* $\big(q_{S'}(\boldsymbol{E}),q_{\underline{m'}}(\boldsymbol{N})\big)$ *is compatible.*
- *Assume* $(U_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}},P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}\,|\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S,\,\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{Z}^m)$ *is a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$. *For any elements* $\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\boldsymbol{C}^{S'}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$, *we put as follows:*

$$U'_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{k}}:=\bigoplus_{\substack{q_{S'}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})=\boldsymbol{\beta}\\ q_{\underline{m'}}(\boldsymbol{h})=\boldsymbol{k}}}U'_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}},\qquad P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{k}}:=\bigoplus_{\substack{q_{S'}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})=\boldsymbol{\beta},\\ q_{\underline{m'}}(\boldsymbol{h})=\boldsymbol{k}}}P_hU_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}.$$

  Then $(U'_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{k}},P_hU'_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{k}})$ *is a splitting.* ▮

Remark 4.2 *We can consider the strongly sequential compatibility of the tuple* $\big(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W}\big)$. *However it is rather complicated, and it is useless for our purpose. So we do not omit it.* ▮

4.4 Extension of splittings

4.4.1 A lift of a splitting of a compatible filtrations

We put $X := \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^p D_i$ for some $p \leq n$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^m$, and ρ be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-bundle, and let $\boldsymbol{F} := \bigl({}^iF \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be a compatible tuple of equivariant filtrations of V.

Lemma 4.11 *Assume that we have an equivariant splitting* $\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I\bigr)$ *of* $\boldsymbol{F}_{|D}$, *i.e., we have a decomposition of* $V_{|D}$ *as follows:*

$$V_{|D} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l} U^D_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \qquad {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\rho}|D} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\leq\boldsymbol{\rho}} U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}.$$

Then there exists an equivariant splitting $\bigl(U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I\bigr)$ *of* $\boldsymbol{F}$ *on a neighbourhood of* O *such that* $U_{\boldsymbol{\eta}|D} = U^D_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$.

Proof We have the equivariant surjection ${}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \longrightarrow {}^I\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ over X. On the divisor D, we have the subbundle $U^D_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \subset {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,D}$ is given. Then we may extend it to the subbundle $\tilde{U}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \subset {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ on a neighbourhood of O, by using Lemma 2.7. ∎

4.4.2 A lift of equivariant splitting

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^p D_i$. We take a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-equivariant bundle over X. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \bigl({}^iF \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$ be a compatible tuple of equivariant filtrations of a vector bundle V.

We have the vector bundle ${}^l\,\mathrm{Gr}^F$, and we have the tuple of the induced filtrations $\boldsymbol{F}^{(1)}_a := \bigl({}^l\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_a \cap {}^iF^{(1)} \bigm| i = 1,\ldots,l-1\bigr)$ on ${}^l\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_a$ for any $a \in \boldsymbol{R}$.

We have the natural isomorphism $\boldsymbol{R}^l \simeq \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1} \times \boldsymbol{R}$. We use the notation $(\boldsymbol{\eta}, a)$ to denote an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$, where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and a denote elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{R}$ respectively.

Let $\bigl(U^D_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| (\boldsymbol{\eta}, a) \in \boldsymbol{R}^l\bigr)$ be a splitting of the restriction $\boldsymbol{F}_{|D}$. For any $a \in \boldsymbol{R}$, let $\bigl(U^{(1)}_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}\bigr)$ be a splitting of the filtration $\boldsymbol{F}^{(1)}_a$ of ${}^l\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_a$.

We have the naturally defined surjection:

$$\pi_a : {}^{\underline{l}}F_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \longrightarrow {}^l\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_a \cap {}^{\underline{l-1}}F^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}.$$

We assume $\pi_{a|D}\bigl(U^D_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}\bigr) = U^{(1)}_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}$.

Lemma 4.12 *We have a splitting* $\bigl(U_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}\bigr)$ *of* $\boldsymbol{F}$ *satisfying the following:*

$$U_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)\,|\,D} = U^D_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}, \qquad \pi_a\bigl(U_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}\bigr) = U^{(1)}_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}.$$

Such a splitting $\bigl(U_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}\bigr)$ *is called a lift of* $\bigl(U^{(1)}_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| (\boldsymbol{\eta}, a) \in \boldsymbol{R}^l\bigr)$ *extending* $\bigl(U^D_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)} \bigm| \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}\bigr)$.

Proof We have only to take an equivariant lift of $U^{(1)}_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}$ extending $U^D_{(\boldsymbol{\eta},a)}$ by applying Lemma 2.7. ∎

4.4.3 Extension of a splitting of compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^p D_i$ for some $p \leq n$. We take a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be an equivariant holomorphic bundle on X. Let $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ be a compatible tuple as in Definition 4.9. Assume that we are given a splitting $\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}} \bigm| \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\bigr)$ of the restriction $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})_{|D}$ (see Definition 4.10). We would like to extend it to a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ on a neighbourhood of O.

Let l' be integer such that $1 \leq l' \leq l_1$. We have the projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$, taking the first l'-components. Then we obtain the projections $\pi_{1,l'} : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$ and $\pi_{3,l'} : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l'} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$. We have the projection $\mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{l'}$, taking the first l'-components. Then we obtain the projection $\pi_{2,l'} : \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l_1} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^S \times \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^{l'}$.

For any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}$, we put $\pi_{1,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{a})$, and we put as follows:

$$
{}^{\underline{l'}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \pi_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigr)\subset\bigl({}^{\underline{l'}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\cap{}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\bigr)_{|D}.
$$

For an element $\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$, we put as follows:

$$
{}^{\underline{l'}}B^D_{\boldsymbol{v}} := \bigoplus_{\pi_{2,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{v}}{}^{\underline{l'}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}
$$

Then we have the decomposition

$$
\bigl({}^{\underline{l'}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\cap{}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\bigr)_{|D}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{3,l'}(\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{}^{\underline{l'}}B^D_{\boldsymbol{v}}. \tag{81}
$$

Then the decomposition (81) gives a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l'}},\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l'}})_{|D}$, by definition.

Lemma 4.13 *Let l' be any integer such that $0\leq l'\leq l_1$, and let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be any element of $\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}$. We can take subbundles ${}^{\underline{l'}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ of ${}^{\underline{l'}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\pi_{1,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})}$ satisfying the following:*

1. *We have the following decomposition, for any element $(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{a})\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$:*

$$
{}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{l'}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{1,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{a})}{}^{\underline{l'}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}.
$$

2. *For any element $\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^{l'}\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$, we put as follows:*

$$
{}^{\underline{l'}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}} := \bigoplus_{\pi_{2,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{v}}{}^{\underline{l'}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}. \tag{82}
$$

   Due to the first condition, we have the decomposition ${}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{l'}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{3,l'}(\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{a})}{}^{\underline{l'}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}}$ for any $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l'}$. Then the decomposition gives a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l'}},\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l'}})$.

3. *We have ${}^{\underline{l'}}U_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D}={}^{\underline{l'}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. In particular, we have ${}^{\underline{l'}}B_{\boldsymbol{v}\,|\,D}={}^{\underline{l'}}B^D_{\boldsymbol{v}}$.*

Proof We can restrict our attention to each component ${}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S$). Thus we may assume that $|S|=1$. In the following, we omit to denote ${}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. We use a descending induction on l'.
1. First we construct such decomposition in the case $l'=l_1$. We have the following decomposition, for any $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l_1}$:

$$
{}^{\underline{l_1}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}\,|\,D}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{1,l_1}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{a}}{}^{\underline{l_1}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}. \tag{83}
$$

Then it is a splitting of the compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l_1}},\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l_1}})_{|D}$. By using Lemma 4.11, we can obtain a splitting $\bigl({}^{\underline{l_1}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1},\ \pi_{1,l_1}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{a}\bigr)$ extending the splitting $\bigl({}^{\underline{l_1}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\ \pi_{1,l_1}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{a}\bigr)$. Thus the claim has been shown in the case $l'=l_1$.

2. We assume that we have already obtained the vector subbundles ${}^{\underline{l'+1}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, and we will construct ${}^{\underline{l'}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

We have the projection $\mathbb{Z}^{l'+1}\longrightarrow\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$ by taking the first l'-components. We denote the induced projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'+1}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$ by $\pi_{4,l'}$. Similarly the projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}^{l'+1}$ induces the morphism $\pi_{5,l'}:\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}^{l'+1}$.

We take ${}^{\underline{l'+1}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}}$ ($\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'+1}$) as in (82). Then we put as follows, for any element $\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$:

$$
{}^{\underline{l'+1}}B''_{\boldsymbol{v}}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{4,l'}(\boldsymbol{v}_1)=\boldsymbol{v}}{}^{\underline{l'+1}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}_1}\subset{}^{l'+1}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\pi_{5,l'}(\boldsymbol{v})}.
$$

Then we have the decomposition, for any $(\boldsymbol{a},b)\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l'+1}=\boldsymbol{R}^{l'}\times\boldsymbol{R}$:

$$ {}^{\underline{l'+1}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{(\boldsymbol{a},b)}=\bigoplus_{\pi_{5,l'}(\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{a},b)}{}^{\underline{l'+1}}B''_{\boldsymbol{v}}. $$

Recall that $\bigl({}^{\underline{l'+1}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}}\,\big|\,\pi_{2,l'+1}(\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{a},b)\bigr)$ gives the splitting of the following tuple of the filtrations on ${}^{\underline{l'+1}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{(\boldsymbol{a},b)}$:

$$ \bigl(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l'+1}},\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l'+1}}\bigr)=\bigl({}^{l'+2}F^{\underline{l'+1}},\ldots,{}^{l}F^{\underline{l'+1}};\,W^{\underline{l'+1}}(\underline{1}),\ldots,W^{\underline{l'+1}}(\underline{l'+1})\bigr). $$

Hence the decomposition $\bigl({}^{\underline{l'+1}}B''_{\boldsymbol{v}}\,\big|\,\pi_{5,l'+1}(\boldsymbol{v})=(\boldsymbol{a},b)\bigr)$ gives the splitting of the following compatible tuple of the filtrations on ${}^{\underline{l'+1}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{(\boldsymbol{a},b)}$:

$$ \bigl({}^{l'+2}F^{\underline{l'+1}},\ldots,{}^{l}F^{\underline{l'+1}};\,W^{\underline{l'+1}}(\underline{1}),\ldots,W^{\underline{l'+1}}(\underline{l'})\bigr). $$

We have the compatible tuple of filtrations $(\boldsymbol{F}^{\underline{l'}},\boldsymbol{W}^{\underline{l'}})$ on ${}^{\underline{l'}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$. We have the isomorphism ${}^{l'+1}\mathrm{Gr}_b\,{}^{\underline{l'}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\simeq{}^{\underline{l'+1}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{(\boldsymbol{a},b)}$.

Then we can take a lift $\bigl({}^{\underline{l'}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{l'_1}\bigr)$ of $\bigl({}^{\underline{l'+1}}B''_{\boldsymbol{v}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{l'_1}\bigr)$ extending $\bigl({}^{\underline{l'}}B^D_{\boldsymbol{v}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{l'_1}\bigr)$, by applying Lemma 4.12.

Then we have the naturally defined isomorphism ${}^{\underline{l'}}B'_{\boldsymbol{v}}\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{l'+1}}B''_{\boldsymbol{v}}$ for any $\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}\times\mathbb{Z}^{l'}$. For any $\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}$ such that $\pi_{2,l'}(\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{v}$, we can lift ${}^{\underline{l'}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ of ${}^{\underline{l'+1}}U'_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ extending ${}^{\underline{l'}}U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, by applying Lemma 2.7. Thus the induction can proceed. ▮

Corollary 4.2 *Assume that we are given a splitting* $\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\bigr)$ *of the restriction* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})_{|D}$. *Then we have a splitting* $\bigl(U_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\bigr)$ *of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$ *defined around the origin* O*, such that* $U_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D}=U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

Proof We have only to put $U_{\boldsymbol{u}}:={}^{\underline{0}}U_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. ▮

4.4.4 Extension of splitting of sequentially compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$

We put $X=\Delta^n$, $D_i:=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{p}D_i$ for some $p\leq n$. We take a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be an equivariant holomorphic bundle on X. Let $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ be a sequentially compatible tuple as in Definition 4.13.

Lemma 4.14 *Assume that we are given a splitting* $\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\bigr)$ *of the restriction* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})_{|D}$. *Then we have a splitting* $\bigl(U_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\boldsymbol{R}^l\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\bigr)$ *of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$*, such that* $U_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D}=U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

Proof It immediately follows from Definition 4.14 and Corollary 4.2. ▮

4.4.5 Extension of splitting of strongly sequentially compatible tuple $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$

We put $X=\Delta^n$, $D_i:=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{p}D_i$ for some $p\leq n$. We take a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be an equivariant holomorphic bundle on X. Let $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$ be a strongly sequentially compatible tuple as in Definition 4.16.

Lemma 4.15 *Assume that we are given a splitting* $\bigl(U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}},\,P_hU^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1},h\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\bigr)$ *of the restriction* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})_{|D}$. *Then we have a splitting* $\bigl(U_{\boldsymbol{u}},\,P_hU_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^S\times\mathbb{Z}^{l_1},h\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\bigr)$ *of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{N})$ *such that* $U_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D}=U^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ *and* $P_hU_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D}=P_hU^D_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

Proof We have only to consider each component ${}^S\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. Thus we may assume $|S|=1$. In the following, we omit to denote $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

We put $V^{(1)}:=P_hGr_h^{W(N_1)}(V)$. We have the surjection $\pi_h:\mathrm{Ker}\bigl(N_1^{h+1}\bigr)\longrightarrow P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N_1)}(V)$. The image of $P_hU^D_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ via the restriction of the morphism $\pi_{h\,|\,D}$ is denoted by $P_hU'^{D}_{\boldsymbol{h}}$.

We obtain the induced sequentially compatible tuple $\boldsymbol{N}^{(1)}:=(N_2^{(1)},\ldots,N_{l_1}^{(1)})$ on $V^{(1)}$, and we obtain the splitting $\bigl(P_hU'^{D}_{\boldsymbol{h}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{Z}^{l_1},q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=h\bigr)$. We can extend it to a splitting $\bigl(P_hU'_{\boldsymbol{h}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{Z}^{l_1},q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=h\bigr)$ by using

Lemma 4.11. We can take an equivariant lift $P_hU_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ of $P_hU'_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ extending $P_hU^D_{\boldsymbol{h}}$. We have only to put as follows, for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and for any $\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}$:

$$P_{|q_1(\boldsymbol{h})|+2a}U_{\boldsymbol{h}} = \begin{cases} N_1^a\big(P_{q_1(\boldsymbol{h})+2a}U_{\boldsymbol{h}+2a\boldsymbol{\delta}}\big), & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) \geq 0), \\ \\ N_1^{a+|q_1(\boldsymbol{h})|}\big(P_{q_1(\boldsymbol{h})+2a}U_{\boldsymbol{h}+2a\boldsymbol{\delta}}\big), & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) < 0). \end{cases}$$

Then $\big(P_hU_{\boldsymbol{h}}\ \big|\, h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\, \boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{l_1}\big)$ gives a desired decomposition. ∎

4.5 Compatibility of the filtrations and nilpotent maps on the divisors

4.5.1 Compatibility of filtrations and decompositions

We put $X = \Delta^n$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. We take a $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on X. Let V be an equivariant vector bundle over X. Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^i\mathbb{E},\ \big|\, i = 1, \ldots, l\big)$ be a tuple of equivariant decompositions ${}^i\mathbb{E}$ of $V_{|D_i}$. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, l\big)$ be a tuple of equivariant filtrations of $V_{|D_i}$.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$. Then we obtain the tuple ${}^I\boldsymbol{E} := \big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in I\big)$ of the equivariant decompositions of $V_{|D_I}$ and the tuple ${}^I\boldsymbol{F} := \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i \in I\big)$ of the equivariant filtrations of $V_{|D_I}$.

Definition 4.17 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F})$ *is called compatible if* $({}^I\boldsymbol{E}, {}^I\boldsymbol{F})$ *are compatible for any* $I \subset \underline{l}$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.7. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l}\big)$ and $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l}\big)$ be as above. Assume that $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible. Let us consider splittings ${}^I\boldsymbol{U} = \big({}^IU_{\boldsymbol{u}} \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^I \times \boldsymbol{R}^I\big)$ for any subset $I \subset \underline{l}$ of $({}^I\boldsymbol{E}, {}^I\boldsymbol{F})$, (Definition 4.7).

For any subset $I \subset I'$, let q_I denote the projection $\boldsymbol{C}^{I'} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{I'} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^I \times \boldsymbol{R}^I$.

Definition 4.18 *A tuple of splittings* $\big({}^I\boldsymbol{U} \,\big|\, I \subset \underline{l}\big)$ *is called a splitting of the tuple* $\big(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}\big)$, *if* ${}^IU_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D_{I'}} = \bigoplus_{q_I(\boldsymbol{u}_1)=\boldsymbol{u}} {}^{I'}U_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}$ *hold for any* $I \subset I'$. ∎

4.5.2 Compatibility of $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i = \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$ for some $l \leq n$. Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \big({}^i\mathbb{E} \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l}\big)$ be a tuple of decompositions of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i \in \underline{l})$. Let $\boldsymbol{F} = \big({}^iF \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l}\big)$ be a tuple of filtrations of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i \in \underline{l})$. We assume that $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible.

Let us consider a tuple $\boldsymbol{W} = \big(W(\underline{i}) \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l_1}\big)$, where $W(\underline{i})$ are filtrations of the vector bundle ${}^{\underline{i}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$ on $D_{\underline{i}}$. We have the induced filtrations $W^J(\underline{i})$ of ${}^J\,\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$ on D_J for any subset J such that $\underline{i} \subset J$.

For any subset $J \subset \underline{l}$, we have the number $m(J)$ determined by the condition $\underline{m(J)} \subset J$ and $m(J) + 1 \notin J$. We denote the tuple $\big(W^J(\underline{i}) \,\big|\, i \in \underline{m(J)}\big)$ by ${}^J\boldsymbol{W}$. Then we obtain the tuple $({}^J\boldsymbol{E}, {}^J\boldsymbol{F}, {}^J\boldsymbol{W})$.

Definition 4.19 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ *is called compatible, if the induced tuples* $({}^J\boldsymbol{E}, {}^J\boldsymbol{F}, {}^J\boldsymbol{W})$ *on* D_J *are compatible for any subset* $J \subset \underline{l}$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.9. ∎

Let us consider splittings ${}^J\boldsymbol{U} = \big({}^JU_{\boldsymbol{u}} \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^J \times \boldsymbol{R}^J \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(J)}\big)$ of the tuple $\big({}^J\boldsymbol{E}, {}^J\boldsymbol{F}, {}^J\boldsymbol{W}\big)$, in the sense of Definition 4.10. For any pair of subsets $I \subset I'$ of $\underline{l}$, let q_I denote the projection $\boldsymbol{C}^{I'} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{I'} \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(I')} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^I \times \boldsymbol{R}^I \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(I)}$.

Definition 4.20 *A tuple of splittings* $\boldsymbol{U} = \big({}^J\boldsymbol{U} \,\big|\, J \subset \underline{l}\big)$ *is called a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$, *if* ${}^IU_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D_{I'}} = \bigoplus_{q_I(\boldsymbol{u}')=\boldsymbol{u}} {}^{I'}U_{\boldsymbol{u}'}$ *hold for any subset* $I \subset I'$ *and for any* $\boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{C}^I \times \boldsymbol{R}^I \times \mathbb{Z}^{m(I)}$. ∎

Proposition 4.1 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$ *be as above, and we assume that it is compatible. Then there exists a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{W})$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.20.

Proof On $D_{\underline{l}}$, we have only to take a splitting ${}^{\underline{l}}\boldsymbol{U}$ of the compatible tuple $({}^{\underline{l}}\boldsymbol{E},{}^{\underline{l}}F,{}^{\underline{l}}W)$.

We construct the splittings ${}^{I}\boldsymbol{U}$ descending inductively on $|I|$. We assume that we have the splittings ${}^{I'}\boldsymbol{U}$ for any $I'\supsetneq I$. Then we will construct the splitting ${}^{I}\boldsymbol{U}$.

We put $\partial D_I := \bigcup_{I'\supsetneq I} D_{I'}$. From the given splittings ${}^{I'}\boldsymbol{U}$ $(I'\supsetneq I)$, we obtain the splitting ${}^{I}\boldsymbol{U}^{\partial D_I}$ of the restriction $({}^{I}\boldsymbol{E},{}^{I}\boldsymbol{F},{}^{I}\boldsymbol{W})_{|\partial D_I}$. Then we can extend ${}^{I}\boldsymbol{U}^{\partial D_I}$ to ${}^{I}\boldsymbol{U}$, due to Lemma 4.13. Thus the inductive construction can proceed, and hence we are done. ▮

Corollary 4.3 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ *be a compatible tuple as in Definition* 4.17. *Then we have a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ *in the sense of Definition* 4.18.

Proof We have only to consider Proposition 4.1 in the case where the filtrations $W(\underline{m})$ are trivial. ▮

4.5.3 Sequential compatibility

We put $X=\Delta^n$, $D_i=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$ for some $l\leq n$. Let $\boldsymbol{E}=\bigl({}^{i}\mathbb{E}\bigm| i\in\underline{l}\bigr)$ be a tuple of decompositions of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i\in\underline{l})$. Let $\boldsymbol{F}=\bigl({}^{i}F\bigm| i\in\underline{l}\bigr)$ be a tuple of filtrations of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i\in\underline{l})$. We assume that $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ is compatible.

Let us consider a tuple $\boldsymbol{N}=\bigl(N_i\bigm| i\in\underline{l_1}\bigr)$, where N_i are nilpotent maps of the vector bundle ${}^{\underline{i}}\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$ on $D_{\underline{i}}$. We have the induced filtrations N_i^J of ${}^{J}\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$ on D_J for any subset J such that $\underline{i}\subset J$.

For any subset $J\subset\underline{l}$, we have the number $m(J)$ determined by the condition $\underline{m(J)}\subset J$ and $m(J)+1\not\in J$. We denote the tuple $\bigl(N_i\bigm| i\in\underline{m(J)}\bigr)$ by ${}^{J}\boldsymbol{N}$. Then we obtain the tuple $({}^{J}\boldsymbol{E},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{F},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{N})$.

Definition 4.21 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is called sequentially compatible, if the induced tuples* $\bigl({}^{J}\boldsymbol{E},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{F},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{N}\bigr)$ *are sequentially compatible for any subset* $J\subset\underline{l}$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.13. ▮

The nilpotent endomorphism $N(\underline{i})$ induces the filtration $W(\underline{i})$ of the vector bundle ${}^{\underline{i}}\mathrm{Gr}^F(V)$ over $D_{\underline{i}}$. Thus we obtain the tuple $\boldsymbol{W}=\bigl(W(\underline{i})\bigm| i\in\underline{l_1}\bigr)$.

Lemma 4.16 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{W})$ *is compatible, in the sense of Definition* 4.19.

Proof It immediately follows from the definition of compatibility. ▮

Let us consider splittings ${}^{J}\boldsymbol{U}=\bigl({}^{J}U_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigm|\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^J\times\boldsymbol{R}^J\times\mathbb{Z}^{m(J)}\bigr)$ of the tuple $\bigl({}^{J}\boldsymbol{E},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{F},{}^{J}\boldsymbol{N}\bigr)$, in the sense of Definition 4.14. For any pair of subsets $I\subset I'$ of $\underline{l}$, let q_I denote the projection $\boldsymbol{C}^{I'}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{I'}\times\mathbb{Z}^{m(I')}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}^{I}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{I}\times\mathbb{Z}^{m(I)}$.

Definition 4.22 *A tuple of splittings* $\boldsymbol{U}=\bigl({}^{J}\boldsymbol{U}\bigm| J\subset\underline{l}\bigr)$ *is called a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$, *if* ${}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D_{I'}}=\bigoplus_{q_I(\boldsymbol{u}')=\boldsymbol{u}}{}^{I'}U_{\boldsymbol{u}'}$ *hold for any subset* $I\subset I'$ *and for any* $\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{C}^I\times\boldsymbol{R}^I\times\mathbb{Z}^{m(I)}$. ▮

Proposition 4.2 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *be sequentially compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.21. *and we assume that it is compatible. Then there exists a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$, *in the sense of Definition* 4.22.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 4.16 and Proposition 4.1. ▮

Corollary 4.4 *Assume that* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$ *is sequentially compatible. Then there exists a frame* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *compatible with the decompositions* ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}$, *the filtrations* ${}^{i}F$ *on* D_i, *and the filtrations* $W(\underline{m})$ *on* $D_{\underline{m}}$.

Proof We have a splitting of $(\boldsymbol{E},{}^{i}F,\mathcal{N}_i)$, due to Proposition 4.2. Then we have only to take a frame compatible with splittings (Lemma 2.9). ▮

For any frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ compatible with $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{N})$, we have the decomposition $\boldsymbol{v}=\bigcup\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}$:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{h}}=\Bigl(v_i\Bigm|\mathbf{deg}^{\mathbb{E},F}(v_i)=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{a}),\ \deg^{W(\underline{m})}(v_i)=h_m\Bigr)$$

Let us consider the special case $N_i=0$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$. Then we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.5 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{F})$ *be a compatible tuple, in the sense of Definition* 4.17. *Then there exists an equivariant frame* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *compatible with the decompositions* ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}$ *and the filtrations* ${}^{i}F$. ▮

4.5.4 Strongly sequential compatibility

We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i = \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$ for some $l \leq n$. Let $\boldsymbol{E} = \bigl({}^i\mathbb{E} \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$ be a tuple of decompositions of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i \in \underline{l})$. Let $\boldsymbol{N} = \bigl(N_i \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$ be a tuple of nilpotent maps of $V_{|D_i}$ $(i \in \underline{l})$.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$. Then we obtain the tuple ${}^I\boldsymbol{E}$ of the decompositions of $V_{|D_I}$. We also obtain the tuple ${}^I\boldsymbol{N} := \bigl(N_{i\,|\,D_I} \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ of nilpotent maps of $V_{|D_I}$.

Definition 4.23 *The tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$ *is called strongly sequentially compatible if* $\bigl({}^I\boldsymbol{E}, {}^I\boldsymbol{N}\bigr)$ *are strongly sequentially compatible for any subset* $I \subset \underline{l}$*, in the sense of Definition* 4.15 ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{E}$ and $\boldsymbol{N}$ be as above. We assume that they are strongly sequentially compatible. Let us consider splittings ${}^I\boldsymbol{U}$ of $({}^I\boldsymbol{E}, {}^I\boldsymbol{N})$, in the sense of Definition 4.16. For any subset $I \subset I'$, let q_I denote the projection $\boldsymbol{C}^{I'} \times \mathbb{Z}^{I'} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^I \times \mathbb{Z}^I$.

Definition 4.24 *A tuple of splittings* $\bigl({}^I\boldsymbol{U} \bigm| I \subset \underline{l}\bigr)$ *is called a splitting of the tuple* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$*, if* ${}^IU_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,D_{I'}} = \bigoplus_{q_I(\boldsymbol{u}')=\boldsymbol{u}} {}^{I'}U_{\boldsymbol{u}'}$ *hold for any* $I \subset I'$. ▮

Proposition 4.3 *Let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$ *be as above, and we assume that it is compatible. Then there exists a splitting of* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$.

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4.1. ▮

Let $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$ be strongly sequentially compatible tuple. From the nilpotent maps $N(\underline{m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} N_i$ of $V_{|D_{\underline{m}}}$, we have the weight filtrations $W(\underline{m})$ of $V_{|D_{\underline{m}}}$. We denote the tuple by $\boldsymbol{W}$.

Corollary 4.6 *We can take a frame* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *compatible with* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{W})$.

Proof Similar to Corollary 4.4. ▮

We have the decomposition $\boldsymbol{v} = \bigcup_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}) \in \boldsymbol{C}^l \times \mathbb{Z}^l} \boldsymbol{v}_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h})}$.

Corollary 4.7 *We can take a compatible frame* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *satisfying the following:*

- *We have the decomposition* $\boldsymbol{v}_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h})} = \bigcup_{a \geq 0} P\boldsymbol{v}_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}),h(a)}$*, where we put* $h(a) = |q_1(\boldsymbol{h})| + 2a$.
- $P\boldsymbol{v}_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}),h}$ *consists of sections* $v_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}),h}, i$ $\bigl(i = 1, \ldots, d(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{h}, h)\bigr)$*, and the following holds:*

$$N(\underline{1})\bigl(v_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}),h,i}\bigr) = \begin{cases} v_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}),h,i}, & (-h+2 \leq q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) \leq h), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Such $\boldsymbol{v}$ *is called strongly compatible with* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{N})$. ▮

5 Some lemmas for generically splitted case

5.1 Filtrations

5.1.1 One nilpotent map

Let R be a discrete valuation ring, K be the quotient field, and k be the residue field. Let V be a free R-module of finite rank. Assume that we are given the following data, in this subsubsection.

Condition 5.1

1. *Let* ${}^iF$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ *be compatible filtrations of* V *in the category of* R*-free modules. We denote the tuple of the filtrations* $({}^iF \,|\, i \in I)$ *by* $\boldsymbol{F}$.

2. *We have the decomposition* $V_{|K} = \bigoplus_{a} U_a$*, which gives a splitting of* $\boldsymbol{F}_{|K}$*.*
3. *Let* N *be a nilpotent endomorphism of* V *preserving* $\boldsymbol{F}$*.*
4. *The restriction* $N_{|K}$ *preserves* $U_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ *for any* $\boldsymbol{b}$*.*
5. *The endomorphism* N *induces the nilpotent endomorphism* ${}^{\underline{l}}N^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *of* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}(V)$*. Then the conjugacy classes of* ${}^{\underline{l}}N^F_{\boldsymbol{a}\,|\,x}$ $(x = k, K)$ *are same.* ▮

Lemma 5.1 *Let* m *be an integer such that* $1 \leq m \leq l$*.*

- *The conjugacy classes of* ${}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F$ *on* ${}^{\underline{m}^c}Gr^F$ *are constant, i.e., the conjugacy classes of* ${}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F_{|x}$ $(x = k, K)$ *are same. Here we put* $\underline{m}^c = \underline{l} - \underline{m}$*.*
- *We put* $H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h} := W_h({}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F) \cap {}^{\underline{m}}F_{\rho_m(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}Gr^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})}$*. Here we put* $\rho_m(\boldsymbol{a}) = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ *and* $\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a}) = (a_{m+1}, \ldots, a_l)$*. Then* $H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h}$ *forms a vector subbundle of* ${}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})}$*, and the image of* $\phi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h} : H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}$ *is same as* $H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h}$*.*

Proof We have the sequence of degeneration ${}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F_{|K} \Longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F_{|k} \Longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}N^F_{|k}$. Since the conjugacy classes of the first one and the last one are same, we obtain the first claim. In particular, $W({}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F) \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ gives a filtration of ${}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ in the category of the vector bundles.

As a preparation of the proof of the second claim, we put as follows for $x = k, K$:

$$H_{m\,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,x} := W_h({}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})})_{|x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}}F_{\rho_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x}$$

Remark 5.1 *The author apologizes that the notation is not so appropriate.* ▮

To see that $H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h}$ forms a vector subbundle, we have only to show the following equality:

$$\dim H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k} = \dim H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}. \tag{84}$$

Let us show the second claim in Lemma 5.1 by an induction on (l, m). Let $P(l, m)$ denote the second claim for (l, m). Note $0 \leq m \leq l$.

In the case $(l, m) = (0, 0)$, the claim $P(0, 0)$ is clear. In the case $(l, m) = (l, 0)$, the claim $P(l, 0)$ follows from the condition 5 in Condition 5.1. Thus we have only to show that $P(l, m-1) + P(l-1, m-1)$ implies $P(l, m)$.

See the following naturally defined morphism:

$$\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h} : H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h} \longrightarrow {}^{m}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{a_m}\, {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})} = {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}.$$

On a generic point K, we have the splitting of the filtration F compatible with N. Hence we have $\mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}) = H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}$. In particular, we have $\dim \mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}) = \dim H_{m-1\,\boldsymbol{a}\,h\,|\,K}$. Since $H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h}$ is a subbundle of ${}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}$ due to the hypothesis $P(l, m-1)$ of the induction. We also obtain the following:

$$\mathrm{Im}\big(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h}\big) \subset H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h}. \tag{85}$$

We have the morphisms $\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k} : H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,k}$. Due to (85), we have the implication $\mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}) \subset H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}$. Thus we obtain the following inequality:

$$\dim \mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}) \leq \dim H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}. \tag{86}$$

Due to the hypothesis $P(l, m-1)$ of the induction, we have $\dim H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K} = \dim H_{m-1\,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}$. Hence we obtain the following:

$$\dim \mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}) \leq \dim \mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}). \tag{87}$$

We have the following for some $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,x} = H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,x} \cap {}^{m}F_{<a_m\,|\,x} = H_{m,\boldsymbol{a}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,h\,|\,x}.$$

For any elements $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{m-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{m}^c}$, we put as follows:

$$I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h} := {}^{\underline{m-1}}F_{\boldsymbol{b}} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{c}} \cap W_h({}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F).$$

Note that the tuple $\bigl(N, {}^1F, \ldots, {}^{m-1}F, {}^{m+1}F, \ldots {}^lF\bigr)$ also satisfies Condition 5.1. Due to the hypothesis $P(l-1, m-1)$ of the induction, $I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h}$ is a vector subbundle, and we have the following:

$$I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h\,|\,x} = {}^{\underline{m-1}}F_{\boldsymbol{b}\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,x} \cap W_h({}^{\underline{m}^c}N^F)_{|x}, \ (x = k, K) \qquad \dim(I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h\,|\,k}) = \dim(I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h\,|\,K}). \tag{88}$$

We have the induced filtration ${}^mF(I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h\,|\,x})$ on $I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c},h\,|\,x}$, and we have the following:

$$\dim \operatorname{Im} \varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,x} = \dim \operatorname{Gr}^{{}^mF}_{a_m}\bigl(I_{\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a}),\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a}),h\,|\,x}\bigr). \tag{89}$$

Hence we have the following equality for $x = k, K$:

$$\sum_{\substack{\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})=\boldsymbol{b},\\ \eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})=\boldsymbol{c}}} \dim \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,x}) = \dim(I_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,x}). \tag{90}$$

Thus we obtain the following equality, from (87), (88) and (90):

$$\dim \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m\,\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,k}) = \dim \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m\,\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,K}). \tag{91}$$

We have the following:

$$\dim H_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,x} = \sum_{\substack{\pi_m(\boldsymbol{b})=\boldsymbol{a},\\ q_m(\boldsymbol{b})\leq q_m(\boldsymbol{a})}} \dim \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{b},h\,|\,x}). \tag{92}$$

Here π_m denote the projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}$, omitting the m-th component.

Thus we obtain (84) from (91) and (92). Due to (91) and $\dim \varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K} = \dim H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,K}$, we obtain $\dim \operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}) = \dim H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h\,|\,k}$, which implies $\operatorname{Im}(\varphi_{m,\boldsymbol{a},h}) = H_{m-1,\boldsymbol{a},h}$. Thus the induction can proceed. $\blacksquare$

5.1.2 A tuple of nilpotent maps

Let V be a free R-module of finite rank. Assume that we are given the following data.

Condition 5.2 *1. Let ${}^iF$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ be compatible filtrations, and N_j $(j = 1, \ldots, \alpha)$ be a commuting tuple of nilpotent maps. We denote the tuple of filtrations by $\boldsymbol{F}$, and we put $N(\underline{i}) = \sum_{j\leq i} N_j$.*

2. *We have the splitting $V_{|K} = \bigoplus U_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ of $\boldsymbol{F}$.*
3. *$N_{j\,|\,K}$ preserves $U_{\boldsymbol{a}}$, and N_j preserves the filtration $\boldsymbol{F}$.*
4. *We have the induced morphisms ${}^{\underline{l}}N^F_j$ $(j = 1, \ldots, \alpha)$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^F$. Then $({}^{\underline{l}}N^F_1, \ldots, {}^{\underline{l}}N^F_{\underline{\alpha}})$ is sequentially compatible.* $\blacksquare$

We put as follows:

$$J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{m}}F_{\rho_m(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\operatorname{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})}.$$

Let us consider the following morphism:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m} : J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\operatorname{Gr}_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}.$$

Lemma 5.2 *$J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m}$ is a subbundle of ${}^{\underline{m}^c}\operatorname{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})}$, and we have $\operatorname{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m}) = J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1}$.*

Proof The argument is essentially same as the proof of the previous one. We put as follows:

$$J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}}F_{\rho_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x}\,.$$

Then we have only to show the following equalities:

(A) $\dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,k} = \dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,K}$.

(B) $\dim \mathrm{Im}\,\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,k} = \dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1\,|\,k}$.

We denote the claims for (l,m) by $P(l,m)$. We show $P(l,m)$ by an induction. Note that $0 \leq m \leq l$. The claim $P(0,0)$ is trivial, and the claim $P(l,0)$ follows from the condition 4 in Condition 5.2. Thus we have only to show that $P(l,m-1)+P(l-1,m-1)$ implies $P(l,m)$.

Let us consider the following morphisms:

$$\psi_1 : W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}\,.$$

Lemma 5.3 *We have the following:*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\psi_1) = W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{m-1}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})}\,.$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 5.1. ∎

Hence we obtain $\mathrm{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x}) \subset J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1\,|\,x}$. Since we are given the splitting of the filtrations $\boldsymbol{F}$ compatible with the nilpotent maps on the generic point K, we have the following:

$$\mathrm{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,K}) = J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1\,|\,K}.$$

Due to the hypothesis $P(l,m-1)$ of the induction, we have the following equality:

$$\dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1\,|\,k} = \dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m-1\,|\,K}. \tag{93}$$

Hence we obtain the following inequality:

$$\dim \mathrm{Im}\,\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,k} \leq \dim \mathrm{Im}\,\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,K}. \tag{94}$$

On the other hand, we have $\mathrm{Ker}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x}) = J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,m\,|\,x}$ for some small positive number ϵ.

For any elements $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{m-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{m}^c}$, we put as follows:

$$I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{m-1}}F_{\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})}\,.$$

Due to the hypothesis $P(l-1,m-1)$ of the induction, $I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}}$ is a vector subbundle. We also have the following

$$I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,x} := \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m-1}}F_{\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x} \cap {}^{\underline{m}^c}\mathrm{Gr}_{\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x}, \quad \dim(I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,k}) = \dim(I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,K}). \tag{95}$$

We have the induced filtration ${}^{m}F\bigl(I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,x}\bigr)$, and we have the following equality:

$$\dim \mathrm{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x}) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}^{{}^mF}_{a_m}\bigl(I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a}),\eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})\,|\,x}\bigr).$$

Thus we have the following:

$$\sum_{\substack{\rho_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{a})=\boldsymbol{b},\\ \eta_m(\boldsymbol{a})=\boldsymbol{c}}} \dim \mathrm{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x}) = \dim(I'_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{c}\,|\,x}). \tag{96}$$

Due to (93), (95) and (96), we obtain the equality $\dim \operatorname{Im} \psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,k} = \dim \operatorname{Im} \psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,K}$, which implies (B) in $P(l,m)$.

We have the following:

$$\dim J_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a},m\,|\,x} = \sum_{\substack{\pi_m(\boldsymbol{b})=\pi_m(\boldsymbol{a}),\\ q_m(\boldsymbol{b})\leq q_m(\boldsymbol{a})}} \dim \operatorname{Im}(\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b},m\,|\,x}).$$

Here π_m denotes the projection $\boldsymbol{R}^l \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{l-1}$, forgetting the m-th component. Then we obtain the claim (A) in $P(l,m)$. ∎

Corollary 5.1 *The tuple of the filtrations* $\bigl(W(\underline{1}),\ldots,W(\underline{\alpha}),{}^1F,\ldots,{}^lF\bigr)$ *are compatible, in the sense of Definition* 4.2*.*

Proof We have the following morphisms:

$$\textstyle\bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\boldsymbol{a}} \xrightarrow{\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}} \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}} \xrightarrow{\phi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}} \operatorname{Gr}^W_{\boldsymbol{h}}\,{}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,.$$

The morphism $\psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}$ is surjective due to Lemma 5.1, and the morphism $\phi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}$ is surjective due to the condition 4 in Condition 5.2.

Let us pick subbundles $C_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}} \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ such that the restriction of $\phi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}} \circ \psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}$ to $C_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}$ is isomorphic.

Since the filtrations ${}^{\underline{l}}W(\underline{1}),\ldots{}^{\underline{l}}W(\underline{\alpha})$ are compatible, we obtain the following:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{a}} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{h}} \psi_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}(C_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}).$$

Since ${}^iF$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$ are compatible, we obtain the following:

$$V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}} \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{h}} C_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}.$$

We have only to show the following:

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\boldsymbol{a}} = \bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{b})\leq(\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a})} C_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{a}}. \tag{97}$$

Since we have the splitting on the generic point K, it is easy to see that the restriction of (97) holds over the generic point K. We have already known that the both sides of (97) are subbundles of V (Lemma 5.1). Then we can conclude that (97) holds on R. ∎

Corollary 5.2 *The conjugacy classes of* $\mathcal{N}(\underline{j})$ *are constant over* R*, and* $\bigcap_{j=1}^{\alpha} W(\underline{j})_{h_j} \cap {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *are vector bundles for any* $\boldsymbol{a}$ *and any* $\boldsymbol{h}$*.* ∎

Proposition 5.1 $(\mathcal{N}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{N}_\alpha,{}^1F,\ldots,{}^lF)$ *are sequentially compatible, in the sense of Definition* 4.12*.*

Proof We have only to show that $(\mathcal{N}_{1\,|\,k},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\,|\,k},{}^1F_{|k},\ldots,{}^lF_{|k})$ are sequentially compatible in the sense of Definition 4.11.

The condition 1 in Definition 4.11 follows from the condition 3 in Condition 5.2. The condition 2 in Definition 4.11 follows from Corollary 5.1. The condition 3 follows Lemma 5.1.

Let us see the condition 4. We use an induction on α. In the case $\alpha = 1$, there remain nothing to prove. We assume that the claim holds in the case $\alpha - 1$, and we will prove the claim also holds in the case α.

On the vector bundle $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N_1)}(V)$, we have the induced filtrations ${}^1F^{(1)},\ldots{}^lF^{(1)}$ and the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_2^{(1)},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(1)}$. Due to the hypothesis of the induction, the tuple $\bigl(\mathcal{N}_2^{(1)},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(2)},{}^1F^{(1)},\ldots,{}^lF^{(1)}\bigr)$ is sequentially compatible.

We put $\mathcal{N}^{(1)}(\underline{i}) = \sum_{j\leq i} \mathcal{N}_j^{(1)}$, which is same as the induced morphism by $\mathcal{N}(\underline{i})$ on $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N_1)}$. Let $W^{(1)}(\underline{i})$ denote the induced filtration on $\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N_1)}$ by $W(\underline{i})$. We have only to show the following:

$$W^{(1)}(\underline{i})_{h+a} \cap \operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(N_1)}\,{}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F = W(\mathcal{N}^{(1)}(\underline{i}))_h \cap \operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(N_1)}\,{}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F\,. \tag{98}$$

Since we have the splitting on the generic point K, it is easy to see that (98) holds when it is restricted to the generic point K. We have already known that the both sides are vector subbundles of $\operatorname{Gr}_a^{W(N_1)}\,{}^I\operatorname{Gr}^F$, we can conclude that (98) holds on R. ∎

5.2 Compatibility of morphisms and filtrations

5.2.1 A compatible tuple of filtrations and a morphism

Let R be a discrete valuation ring, K be the quotient field, and k be the residue field. Let $V^{(a)}$ be free R-modules $(a=1,2)$, and let $\boldsymbol{F} := \bigl({}^iF(V^{(a)}) \bigm| i\in I\bigr)$ be a compatible tuple of filtrations of $V^{(a)}$ in the category of free R-modules. Let $f : V^{(1)} \longrightarrow V^{(2)}$ be the morphism preserving the filtrations. We have the induced morphism ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(f) : {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr)$ for any element $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I$.

Let S be a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. For simplicity, we use the following notation:

$$
{}^IF_S(V^{(a)}) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in S} {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(V^{(a)}), \quad {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_S(V^{(a)}) := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in S} {}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(V^{(a)}).
$$

We have the naturally defined projection $\pi_S : {}^IF_S\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_S\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)$.

Proposition 5.2 *Assume the following:*

- *We have a splitting* $V^{(a)}_{|K} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I} U^{(a)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *of the tuple of filtrations* $\boldsymbol{F}_{|K}$ *satisfying* $f_K(U^{(a)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \subset U^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$.
- *The image* $\mathrm{Im}\,{}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(f)$ *is the vector subbundle of* ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(V^{(2)})$, *for any* $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I$.

Then the following claims hold.

1. *For any finite subset* $S\subset\boldsymbol{R}^I$, *the image* $f\bigl({}^IF_S(V^{(1)})\bigr)$ *is a vector subbundle of* $V^{(2)}$.
2. *We have the following:*
$$
f\bigl({}^IF_S(V^{(1)})\bigr) = \mathrm{Im}(f) \cap {}^IF_S(V^{(2)}).
$$

Proof For any finite subset S of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$, we put as follows:

$$
L(S) := \max\Bigl\{\sum_{i\in I} q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) \Bigm| \boldsymbol{a}\in S\Bigr\}.
$$

The following claim is denoted by $P(r)$:

$P(r)$ The claim of Proposition 5.2 holds in the case $L(S)\leq r$.

Lemma 5.4

- *The claim* $P(r)$ *holds for any sufficiently negative* r.
- *If the claim* $P(r)$ *holds for some* $r\in\boldsymbol{R}$, *then there exists a positive number such that* $P(r')$ *holds for any* r' *such that* $r\leq r'\leq r+\epsilon$.

Proof It follows from the finiteness of the set $\bigl\{b\in\boldsymbol{R} \bigm| \exists i,\, \exists a,\, {}^i\mathrm{Gr}^F_b\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)\neq 0,\bigr\}$. ∎

Due to Lemma 5.4, we have only to show that $P(r)$ holds under the assumption $P(r')$ holds for any real numbers $r'<r$, which we will show in the following.

Lemma 5.5 *Let* S *be a finite subset of* $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. *Let us consider the projection* $\pi_S : {}^IF_S\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^F_S\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)$. *The kernel of* π_S *is described as the form* ${}^IF_{S'}\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)$ *for some finite subset* $S'\subset\boldsymbol{R}^I$ *such that* $L(S')<L(S)$.

Proof We have the following:

$$
\mathrm{Ker}\,\pi_S = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\lneq\boldsymbol{a}} {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr).
$$

Then it is clear from the compatibility of the tuple $\boldsymbol{F}$. ∎

Lemma 5.6 *Let us consider the morphism* $\pi'_S : f\bigl({}^I F_S(V^{(1)})\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(V^{(2)})$*, induced by the projection* π_S*. Then we have the following:*

$$\operatorname{Im} \pi'_S = \operatorname{Im} {}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(f) \subset {}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(V^{(2)}).$$

Proof We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
{}^I F_S(V^{(1)}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_S"'] & {}^I F_S(V^{(2)}) \arrow[d, "\pi_S"'] \\
{}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(V^{(1)}) \arrow[r, "{}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(f)"] & {}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(V^{(2)}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then Lemma 5.6 immediately follows. ∎

We always have $f\bigl({}^{l}F_S(V^{(1)})\bigr) \subset \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_S(V^{(2)})$. Hence we always have the following:

$$\pi_S\Bigl(f\bigl({}^{l}F_S(V^{(1)})\bigr)\Bigr) \subset \pi_S\Bigl(\operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_S(V^{(2)})\Bigr). \qquad (99)$$

Lemma 5.7 *In* (99)*, the equality holds.*

Proof Since we have the splitting on the generic point K, it is easy to see that the equality holds, when we restrict (99) to the generic point. Since the left hand side is a vector subbundle in ${}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_S(V^{(2)})$ due to Lemma 5.6, we obtain the equality on R. ∎

Let us pick an appropriate finite subset $S' \subset \boldsymbol{R}^I$ such that $L(S') < L(S)$ and $\operatorname{Ker} \pi_S = {}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)$ $(a = 1, 2)$. We have the following:

$$\operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_S(V^{(2)}) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S = \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr). \qquad (100)$$

We have the following implication:

$$f\bigl({}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) \subset f\bigl({}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S \subset \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S. \qquad (101)$$

Due to the assumption $P(r')$ $(r' < r)$, we have $f\bigl({}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) = \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr)$. Then we obtain the following equality from (100) and (101):

$$f\bigl({}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S = f\bigl({}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) = \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_{S'}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr) = \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S. \qquad (102)$$

Hence we obtain the equality $f\bigl({}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) = \operatorname{Im}(f) \cap {}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr)$.

Due to the assumption $P(r')$ $(r' < r)$, $f\bigl({}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Ker} \pi_S$ is a vector subbundle of $V^{(2)}$. It follows that $f\bigl({}^I F_S\bigl(V^{(1)}\bigr)\bigr)$ is a vector subbundle of $V^{(2)}$. Thus the proof of Proposition 5.2 is accomplished. ∎

Corollary 5.3 *Under the assumption of Proposition* 5.2*, we have* ${}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\bigl(\operatorname{Im}(f)\bigr) = \operatorname{Im} {}^I \operatorname{Gr}^F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(f)$*, for any element* $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$*.* ∎

5.2.2 Decomposition

Let R, K, k, $V^{(a)}$ and $\boldsymbol{F} = \bigl({}^i F \bigm| i \in I\bigr)$ be as in the subsubsection 5.2.1. Let $f : V^{(1)} \longrightarrow V^{(2)}$ and $g : V^{(2)} \longrightarrow V^{(1)}$ be morphisms preserving the filtrations.

Lemma 5.8 *Assume the following:*

- *We have splittings* $V^{(a)}_{|K} = \bigoplus U^{(a)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *of the filtrations* $\boldsymbol{F}\bigl(V^{(a)}\bigr)_{|K}$ *on the generic point* K
- *We have* $f_{|K}\bigl(U^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,K}\bigr) \subset U^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,K}$*, and* $g_{|K}\bigl(U^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,K}\bigr) \subset U^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\,|\,K}$ *on the generic point* K*.*

- *We have* ${}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr)=\operatorname{Im}\bigl({}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(f)\bigr)\oplus\operatorname{Ker}\bigl({}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(g)\bigr)$*. In particular,* $\operatorname{Im}\bigl({}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(f)\bigr)$*,* $\operatorname{Ker}\bigl({}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(g)\bigr)$ *and* $\operatorname{Im}({}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(g))$ *are the vector subbundles.*

Then we have the decomposition $V^{(2)}=\operatorname{Im}(f)\oplus\operatorname{Ker}(g)$*.*

Proof $\operatorname{Im}(f)$ and $\operatorname{Ker}(g)$ are vector subbundles of $V^{(2)}$, due to Proposition 5.2. The tuple of filtrations $\boldsymbol{F}\bigl(V^{(2)}\bigr)$ induce the tuple of filtrations $\boldsymbol{F}\bigl(\operatorname{Im}(f)\bigr)$ and $\boldsymbol{F}\bigl(\operatorname{Ker}(g)\bigr)$ on R The decomposition $\bigl(U^{(a)}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{I}\bigr)$ of $V^{(2)}_{|K}$ induces the decomposition of $\operatorname{Im}(f)$ and $\operatorname{Ker}(g)$ on the generic point. Let us consider the naturally defined morphism $\Phi:\operatorname{Im}(f)\oplus\operatorname{Ker}(g)\longrightarrow V^{(2)}$. Then it is easy to see that the assumption of Proposition 5.2 is satisfied. Thus the image $\operatorname{Im}\Phi$ is a vector subbundle of $V^{(2)}$. Since $\operatorname{Im}(\Phi_{|K})$ and $V^{(2)}_{|K}$ are same, we obtain $\operatorname{Im}(\Phi)=V^{(2)}$ on R. ▮

6 Model bundle

6.1 Basic example I

6.1.1 Preliminary

We put $X:=\Delta$ and $D=\{O\}$. We put $E:=\mathcal{O}\cdot e$. We consider the hermitian metric h given by $h(e,e)=|z|^{-2a}$. We consider the Higgs field θ given by $\theta(e)=e\cdot\alpha\cdot dz/z$. Then we have the following:

$$\overline{\partial}_E e=0,\quad \partial_E e=e\cdot\Bigl(-a\cdot\frac{dz}{z}\Bigr),\quad \theta^{\dagger}(e)=e\cdot\overline{\alpha}\cdot\frac{d\bar{z}}{\bar{z}}.$$

We put $v=\exp\bigl(-\bar{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log|z|^2\bigr)\cdot e$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\bigl(\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger}\bigr)v=0,\quad \mathbb{D}v=\bigl(\lambda\cdot\partial_E+\theta\bigr)\cdot v=\bigl(-\bar{\alpha}\cdot\lambda^2-a\cdot\lambda+\alpha\bigr)v\cdot\frac{dz}{z}.$$

Then v gives a holomorphic frame of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}$. We put as follows:

$$s:=\exp\bigl(\bigl(\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda+a-\alpha\cdot\lambda^{-1}\bigr)\cdot\log z\bigr)\cdot v=\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\lambda^{-1}\log z+a\cdot\log z-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log\overline{z}\bigr)\cdot e.$$

Then s is a frame of the holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{H}(E)$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}$.

We put $e^{\dagger}:=|z|^{2a}\cdot e$. Then we have $\partial_E e^{\dagger}=0$. Namely $e^{\dagger}$ gives the frame of (E,∂_E). We also have $h(e^{\dagger},e^{\dagger})=|z|^{2a}$, and $\overline{\partial}_E e^{\dagger}=e^{\dagger}\cdot a\cdot d\bar{z}/\bar{z}$.

We put $v^{\dagger}:=\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log|z|^2\bigr)\cdot e^{\dagger}$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\bigl(\partial_E+\mu\cdot\theta\bigr)\cdot v^{\dagger}=0,\quad \mathbb{D}^{\dagger}v^{\dagger}=\bigl(\mu\cdot\overline{\partial}_E+\theta^{\dagger}\bigr)\cdot v^{\dagger}=\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\mu^2+a\cdot\mu+\overline{\alpha}\bigr)\cdot v^{\dagger}\cdot\frac{d\bar{z}}{\bar{z}}.$$

Namely $v^{\dagger}$ is a frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}-\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}$. We put as follows:

$$s^{\dagger}=\exp\bigl(\bigl(\mu\cdot\alpha-a-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\mu^{-1}\bigr)\log\bar{z}\bigr)\cdot v^{\dagger}.$$

Then $s^{\dagger}$ is a frame of $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}(E)$.

Lemma 6.1 *We have* $s=s^{\dagger}$*.*

Proof It can be shown by a direct calculation, as follows:

$$s^{\dagger}=\exp\bigl(-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\mu^{-1}\cdot\log\bar{z}-a\cdot\log\bar{z}-\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log z\bigr)\cdot e^{\dagger}=\exp\bigl(-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\mu^{-1}\cdot\log\bar{z}+a\cdot\log z-\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log z\bigr)e=s.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

We put $w:=v_{|\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\times\{O\}}$ and $w^{\dagger}:=v^{\dagger}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}\times\{O\}}$. The induced objects $\mathcal{G}_u$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{u^{\dagger}}$ are generated by w and $w^{\dagger}$ respectively.

6.1.2 The gluings of $S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ and $S_u(E,P)$

By definition, we have $\Phi_u^{\mathrm{can}}(s)=w_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}$ and $\Phi^{\dagger\,\mathrm{can}}_{u^\dagger}(s^\dagger)=w^\dagger_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}$. We also have $s=s^\dagger$. Then the gluing of $S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ is given by the relation $w_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}=w^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}$. In particular, $S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$.

Let us see the gluing of $S(E,P)$. We denote $v_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*\times\{P\}}$ by $v_{|P}$ for simplicity of notation. We will also use the similar convention. We have the following:

$$v_{|P}=\exp\bigl(-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot e_{|P}.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}v^\dagger_{|P}=\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot e^\dagger_{|P}&=\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log|z(P)|^2+a\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot e_{|P}\\&=\exp\bigl((-\alpha\cdot\mu+a+\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda)\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot v_{|P}.\end{aligned}\tag{103}$$

We put as follows:

$$\tilde{w}:=\exp\bigl(\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot w,\quad \tilde{w}^\dagger:=\exp\bigl(\alpha\cdot\mu\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot w^\dagger.$$

Then $\mathcal{G}_u$ and $\mathcal{G}_u^\dagger$ are generated by w and $w^\dagger$ respectively, and the gluing of $S_u(E,P)$ is given by the relation $\tilde{u}^\dagger=\tilde{u}\cdot|z(P)|^{2a}$. In particular, $S_u(E,P)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$.

Corollary 6.1

- *The vector bundles* $S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ *and* $S(E,P)$ *are pure twistors of weight* 0.
- *A frame of* $H^0\bigl(\mathbb{P}^1,S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)\bigr)$ *is given by* $w=w^\dagger$.
- *A frame of* $H^0\bigl(\mathbb{P}^1,S_u(E,P)\bigr)$ *is given by* $\tilde{u}=|z(P)|^{-2a}\cdot\tilde{u}^\dagger$. $\blacksquare$

6.1.3 Pairing

The pairing $S:\mathcal{E}\otimes\sigma^*\mathcal{E}\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$ is given as follows:

$$S\bigl(v,\sigma^*(v^\dagger)\bigr)=h\bigl(v(\lambda,x),v^\dagger(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)=\exp\bigl(-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log|z|^2\bigr)\cdot\overline{\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\bigl(-\overline{\lambda}\bigr)\cdot\log|z|^2\bigr)}=1.$$

Thus the induced pairing $S:\mathcal{G}_u\otimes\sigma^*\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ is given by $S\bigl(w,\sigma^\dagger w^\dagger\bigr)=1$.

For the global section $v_1=w=w^\dagger$ of $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$, we have $S(v_1,\sigma^*v_1)=S(w,\sigma^*w^\dagger)=1>0$. In particular, the pairing $S:S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)\otimes\sigma^*S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$ induces the polarization of $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$.

For the global section $v_2=\tilde{u}=|z(P)|^{-2a}\cdot\tilde{u}^\dagger$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}S\bigl(v_2,\sigma^*v_2\bigr)&=S\bigl(\tilde{u},\sigma^*|z|^{-2a}\tilde{u}^\dagger\bigr)\\&=|z|^{-2a}\cdot\exp\bigl(\overline{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)\cdot\overline{\exp\bigl(-\alpha\cdot\overline{\lambda}\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\bigr)}\cdot S(w,\sigma^*w^\dagger)=|z(P)|^{-2a}>0.\end{aligned}\tag{104}$$

In particular, the pairing $S:S_u(E,P)\otimes\sigma^*S_u(E,P)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$ is the polarization.

6.1.4 The canonical frame

Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Let $u=(a,\alpha)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$.

The case $\alpha\neq 0$
Let b be a real number such that $b\notin\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)+\mathbb{Z}$. In the case we have the integer ν determined by the condition $b-1<\nu+\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)<b$. Let v be as in the subsubsection 6.1.1. Then the section $z^{-\nu}v$ is a frame of ${}_b\mathcal{L}(u)$, which we call the canonical frame at λ_0.

The case $\alpha=0$. In the case, we recall $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)=a$ for any λ, and we have $v=e$. Let b be any real number. We have the integer ν determined by the condition $b-1<\nu+a\leq b$. Then the frame $z^{-\nu}\cdot v$ is called the canonical frame of $\mathcal{L}(u)$ at λ_0.

6.1.5 The higher dimensional case

Let $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be an element of $(\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C})^n$, where $u_i = (a_i, \alpha_i)$. We put $X = \Delta^n$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1} D_i$, where $D_i = \{z_i = 0\}$. Then we put $L(\boldsymbol{u}) = \mathcal{O}_{X-D} \cdot e$. We have the Higgs field θ and the metric h determined as follows:

$$\theta \cdot e = e \cdot \sum \alpha_i \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i}, \quad h(e,e) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |z_i|^{-2a_i}.$$

Let q_i denote the projection of X onto the i-th component. Then we have the isomorphism $L(\boldsymbol{u}) \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n q_i^* L(u_i)$ compatible with the metric and the Higgs field. Hence $(L(\boldsymbol{u}), \theta, h)$ is a harmonic bundle. We have the holomorphic frame of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{u})$ over $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$:

$$v = \exp\Bigl(-\sum \alpha_i \cdot \log |z_i|^2\Bigr) \cdot e.$$

Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We have the canonical frame f_i of $\mathcal{L}(u_i)$ around λ_0. Then the section $\prod_{i=1}^n q_i^* f_i$ gives the canonical frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{u})$ around λ_0.

6.2 Basic example II

6.2.1 Preliminary

We put $X := \Delta$ and $D := \{O\}$. We put $y := -\log |z|^2$. We put $E := \mathcal{O}_{X-D} \cdot e_1 \oplus \mathcal{O}_{X-D} \cdot e_{-1}$. The metric h is given as follows:

$$H(h, \boldsymbol{e}) = \begin{pmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & y^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Higgs field θ is given as follows:

$$\theta \cdot \boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{e} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{dz}{z}.$$

Then $Mod(2) = (E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is a harmonic bundle. (See our previous paper [38], for example). We take a frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v^{1,0}, v^{0,1})$ of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}$ given as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{e} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\lambda \cdot y^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{105}$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}$ gives a normalizing frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$, i.e., it satisfies the following condition:

$$\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{dz}{z}.$$

We also put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{e}^\dagger = \boldsymbol{e} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} y^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger = \boldsymbol{e}^\dagger \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\mu \cdot y^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ gives a normalizing frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\dagger$:

$$\mathbb{D}^\dagger \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger = \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \frac{d\bar{z}}{\bar{z}}.$$

6.2.2 The induced objects

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0) = \bigl\{(n,0) \bigm| n \in \mathbb{Z}\bigr\} \subset \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$. We have the natural isomorphisms $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{(n,0)}(E) \simeq S^{\mathrm{can}}_{(0,0)}(E)$ and $S_{(n,0)}(E,P) \simeq S_{(0,0)}(E,P)$. Hence we only consider the case $\boldsymbol{u} = (0,0)$. In the following, we omit to denote the subscript $\boldsymbol{u}$. We also omit to denote '$\underline{1}$'.

We put $u^{1,0} := v^{1,0}_{|O \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ and $u^{0,1} = v^{0,1}_{|O \times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$. We have $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot u^{1,0} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot u^{0,1}$, by definition. We also have $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}^\sharp}$. Thus we have the following:

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})_{|P} = \mathcal{E}_{|P} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot v^{1,0}_{|P} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot v^{0,1}_{|P} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_{1\,|\,P} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \cdot e_{-1\,|\,P}.$$

Here we use the notation "$|P$" instead of "$|\{P\}\times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^{*}$". In the following in this subsubsection, we use this abbreviation of the notation for simplicity.

We have the following equality on the plane $\{P\}\times \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{|P} = \boldsymbol{e}_{|P}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\lambda\cdot y(P)^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the conjugate side, we have the following:

$$\mathcal{G}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot u^{\dagger\,1,0} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}, \qquad u^{\dagger\,1,0} := v^{\dagger\,1,0}_{|O\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}, \quad u^{\dagger\,0,1} := v^{\dagger\,0,1}_{|O\times\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}.$$

We also have the following:

$$\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger})_{|P} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot v^{\dagger\,1,0}_{|P} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot v^{\dagger\,0,1}_{|P} = \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot e^{\dagger}_{1\,|\,P} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}\cdot e^{\dagger}_{-1\,|\,P}.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}_{|P} = \boldsymbol{e}^{\dagger}_{|P}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\mu\cdot y(P)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{e}^{\dagger}_{|P} = \boldsymbol{e}_{|P} \begin{pmatrix} y(P)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & y(P) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{106}$$

6.2.3 The gluing of $S(P)$ and the nilpotent maps

Then we have the following:

$$\Phi_{(P,O)}\big(\boldsymbol{e}_{|P}\big) = \boldsymbol{u}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda\cdot y(P)^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \Phi^{\dagger}_{(P,O)}\big(\boldsymbol{e}^{\dagger}_{|P}\big) = \boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mu\cdot y(P)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{107}$$

From (107) and the first equation in (106), the vector bundle $S(E,P)$ is obtained by the following gluing:

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mu\cdot y(P)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} y(P) & 0 \\ 0 & y(P)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}\cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -y(P)^{-1}\cdot\lambda \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} y(P) & -\lambda \\ \mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}$ is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}: \quad u^{1,0} \longmapsto u^{0,1}\otimes t_0, \quad u^{0,1}\longmapsto 0, \quad \text{on the plane } \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda,$$

$$\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}: \quad u^{\dagger\,1,0} \longmapsto 0, \quad u^{\dagger\,0,1}\longmapsto -u^{\dagger\,1,0}\otimes t_\infty, \quad \text{on the plane } \boldsymbol{C}_\mu.$$

Hence the vector bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{1}$ is given by the gluing $u^{1,0} = \mu\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}$. The vector bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{-1}$ is given by $u^{0,1} = -\lambda\cdot u^{\dagger\,1,0}$. Therefore $\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{a}$ is a pure twistor of weight a, and $(S(E,P), W^{\triangle})$ is a mixed twistor.

6.2.4 The pairing

The induced pairing $S:\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{1}\otimes\sigma^{*}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{-1}\longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$ is given as follows:

$$u^{1,0}\otimes\sigma^{*}(u^{\dagger\,1,0})\longmapsto 1, \quad u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes\sigma^{*}(u^{0,1})\longmapsto 1.$$

Remark 6.1 *Note that we have the following equality on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^{*}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} u^{1,0}\otimes\sigma^{*}(u^{\dagger\,1,0}) &= \mu\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes\sigma^{*}(-\lambda\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}) = \mu\cdot\varphi^{-1}(-\lambda)\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes\sigma^{*}(u^{\dagger\,0,1}) \\ &= \mu\cdot\overline{\big(-(-\overline{\lambda})\big)}\cdot u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes\sigma^{*}(u^{\dagger\,0,1}) = u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes\sigma^{*}u^{\dagger\,0,1}. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

Thus the pairing S is well defined, of course. $\blacksquare$

We have induced the pairing $S\big(\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big):\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{1}\otimes\sigma^{*}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W^{\triangle}}_{1}\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-1)$.

Lemma 6.2 *It gives a polarization.*

Proof Let us consider the induced pairing $\mathrm{Gr}_1^{W^{\triangle}}\otimes\mathcal{O}(-1)\otimes\sigma^*\big(\mathrm{Gr}_1^{W^{\triangle}}\otimes\mathcal{O}(-1)\big)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$. A base s of the one dimensional vector space $H^0\big(\mathbb{P}^1,\mathrm{Gr}_1^{W^{\triangle}}\otimes\mathcal{O}(-1)\big)$ is given by the following:

$$s=-\sqrt{-1}\cdot u^{1,0}\otimes f_0^{(-1)}=u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes f_\infty^{(-1)}.$$

Via the pairing $S\big(\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}\otimes\mathrm{id}\big)$, we have the composite of the following correspondences:

$$\begin{aligned}\big(-\sqrt{-1}\cdot u^{1,0}\otimes f_0^{(-1)}\big)\otimes\sigma^*\big(u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes f_\infty^{(-1)}\big)&\longmapsto -\sqrt{-1}\big(u^{0,1}\otimes t_0^{(-1)}\otimes f_0^{(-1)}\big)\otimes\sigma^*\big(u^{\dagger\,0,1}\otimes f_\infty^{(-1)}\big)\\ &\longmapsto -\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}\otimes\sigma^*\big(f_\infty^{(-1)}\big)\longmapsto 1.\end{aligned}\tag{109}$$

Thus we are done. ∎

In all, we obtain the following.

Corollary 6.2 *The tuple* $\big(S(E,P),W,\mathcal{N}^{\triangle},S\big)$ *is a polarized mixed twistor structure.* ∎

6.2.5 The case $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$

Next we consider the vector bundle $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$. Let $\pi:\mathbb{H}\longrightarrow\Delta^*$ be the universal covering given by $\zeta\longmapsto\exp\big(\sqrt{-1}\zeta\big)=z$. Pick a point $\tilde{P}$ such that $\pi(\tilde{P})=P$. We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\exp\Big(-\lambda^{-1}\cdot\big(\log z-\log z(\tilde{P})\big)\begin{pmatrix}0&0\\1&0\end{pmatrix}\Big).$$

Then $\boldsymbol{s}$ is a frame of the space of multi-valued flat sections, such that $\boldsymbol{s}(\tilde{P})=\boldsymbol{v}(P)$.

We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s}^{\dagger}=\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}\cdot\exp\Big(-\mu^{-1}\cdot\big(\log\bar{z}-\log\bar{z}(\tilde{P})\big)\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\0&0\end{pmatrix}\Big).$$

Then $\boldsymbol{s}^{\dagger}$ be a frame of the space of multi-valued sections such that $\boldsymbol{s}^{\dagger}(\tilde{P})=\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}(P)$. Then we have the following relation:

$$\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{s}^{\dagger}\begin{pmatrix}y&-\lambda\\ \mu&0\end{pmatrix}.$$

To see the morphism Φ^{can}, we develop $\boldsymbol{s}$ as a polynomial of $\log z$, and we take the degree 0-part. Therefore the morphism $\mathcal{H}\longrightarrow\mathcal{G}_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}}$ is given as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s}\longmapsto\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\exp\Big(\lambda^{-1}\log z(\tilde{P})\begin{pmatrix}0&0\\1&0\end{pmatrix}\Big).$$

Similarly, we obtain the morphism $\mathcal{H}\longrightarrow\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}}$:

$$\boldsymbol{s}^{\dagger}\longmapsto\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\cdot\exp\Big(\mu^{-1}\log\bar{z}(\tilde{P})\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\0&0\end{pmatrix}\Big).$$

Then the gluing of $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\cdot\exp\left(\mu^{-1}\log\bar{z}(\tilde{P})\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\0&0\end{pmatrix}\right)\cdot\begin{pmatrix}y&-\lambda\\ \mu&0\end{pmatrix}\cdot\exp\left(-\lambda^{-1}\log z(\tilde{P})\begin{pmatrix}0&0\\1&0\end{pmatrix}\right)\\ &=\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\cdot\exp\left(\mu^{-1}\log|z(P)|^2\begin{pmatrix}0&1\\0&0\end{pmatrix}\right)\cdot\begin{pmatrix}y&-\lambda\\ \mu&0\end{pmatrix}=\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}1&-\mu^{-1}y\\0&1\end{pmatrix}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}y&-\lambda\\ \mu&0\end{pmatrix}=\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}\begin{pmatrix}0&-\lambda\\ \mu&0\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}\tag{110}$$

Thus $S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}_1^{W^{\triangle}}\oplus\mathrm{Gr}_{-1}^{W^{\triangle}}$.

The filtration $W^{\triangle}$ gives the mixed twistor structure, and the pairing S gives the polarization, which has been already shown. In all, we obtain the following.

Lemma 6.3 *The tuples* $\big(S^{\mathrm{can}},W,\mathcal{N}^{\triangle},S\big)$ *are polarized mixed twistor structures.* ∎

6.2.6 The rank l case

By taking the $(l-1)$-th symmetric product of the harmonic bundle $Mod(2)$ given in the subsubsection 6.2.1, we obtain the harmonic bundle $Mod(l)$, whose rank is l. Let $\mathcal{M}od(l)$ denote the deformed holomorphic bundle of $Mod(l)$.

The frame $\boldsymbol{w}$ of $\mathcal{M}od(l)$ is called canonical, if the λ-connection form with respect to $\boldsymbol{w}$ is of the form $A \cdot dz/z$ for some constant nilpotent matrix A. The frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of $\mathcal{M}od(2)$ given in (105) induces a canonical frame of $\mathcal{M}od(l)$.

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 6.4 *Let V be a vector space over $\boldsymbol{C}$, and let N be a nilpotent map of V. We have a harmonic bundle of the form $\bigoplus_i Mod(l_i)$ such that the residue is isomorphic to (V, N). Such a harmonic bundle is denoted by $E(V, N)$, although it is not uniquely determined.* ▮

6.2.7 General model bundles

In general, the harmonic bundle of the following form is called a model bundle:

$$\bigoplus_i Mod(l_i) \otimes L(u_i).$$

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We have canonical frames of $\mathcal{L}(u_i)$ and $\mathcal{M}od(l_i)$ around λ_0. The tensor products of them induce the frame of $\bigoplus \mathcal{M}od(l_i) \otimes \mathcal{L}(u_i)$. The induced frame is called a canonical frame.

Part II

Prolongation of deformed holomorphic bundles

7 Harmonic bundles on Δ^*

7.1 Simpson's Main estimate

7.1.1 Statement

Let $R > 0$ be a positive number. We put $X = \Delta(R)$, and $D = \{O\}$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle defined over a neighbourhood of $X - D$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^*$. We denote $\theta = f_0 \cdot dz/z$. Assume that we have the decomposition $E = \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} E_a$ satisfying the following conditions:

Condition 7.1

1. *The endomorphism f_0 preserves the decomposition, that is, $f_0 = \bigoplus_a f_{0\,a}$ for $f_{0\,a} \in End(E_a)$.*
2. *There exists $C_0 > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$, such that $|b - a| < C_0 \cdot |z|^{\epsilon_0}$ for any eigenvalue b of $f_{0\,a}(z)$.*
3. *We put $\xi := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0)} \operatorname{rank}(E_a) \cdot |a|^2$. Then we have $\xi \neq 0$.* ▮

We take a total order $\leq_1$ of $S_0 := \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0)$. Then we obtain the filtration F defined as follows:

$$F_a E := \bigoplus_{b \leq_1 a} E_b.$$

Let E'_a denote the orthogonal complement of $F_{<a}(E)$ in $F_a(E)$. We have $\dim(E_a) = \dim(E'_a)$, but $E_a \neq E'_a$ in general. We put as follows:

$$\rho := \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} a \cdot id_{E_a} \in \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} \operatorname{End}(E_a), \quad \rho' := \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} a \cdot id_{E'_a} \in \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} \operatorname{End}(E'_a). \tag{111}$$

Note we have $|\rho'|_h^2 = \xi$.

The following proposition is our main purpose in the subsection 7.1. It will be proved in the subsubsections 7.1.2–7.1.6.

Proposition 7.1

(I) *Let R_1 be a positive number such that $R_1 < R$. There exists $C_1 > 0$ satisfying the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_1)$:*

$$|f_0 - \rho'|_h \leq C_1 \cdot \Bigl(-\log \frac{|z|}{R}\Bigr)^{-1} \tag{112}$$

(II) *There exist positive constants $C_2 > 0$, $\epsilon_2 > 0$ and $R_2 > 0$, satisfying the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_2)$:*

$$\bigl|\rho - \rho'\bigr|_h \leq C_2 \cdot |z|^{\epsilon_2} \tag{113}$$

Here C_1, C_2, ϵ_2, R_2 depends only on the constants R, C_0, ϵ_0, R_1, S_0, $\mathrm{rank}(E)$ and the set $\bigl\{\mathrm{rank}\, E_a \bigm| a \in S_0\bigr\}$.

For simplicity, we introduce the following terminology which is used only in this subsection.

Definition 7.1 *A constant is called good, if it depends only on the constants R, C_0, ϵ_0, R_1, S_0, $\mathrm{rank}(E)$ and the set $\bigl\{\mathrm{rank}\, E_a \bigm| a \in S_0\bigr\}$.* ▮

Remark 7.1 *Proposition 7.1 was proved by Simpson (Theorem 1 in [50]). In fact, we closely follow his argument. However we would like to care the dependence of constants, to use the proposition in higher dimensional case. It is the reason why we give some detail.* ▮

7.1.2 Preliminary

We put $f := f_0 \cdot z^{-1}$. Recall we have the following fundamental inequality due to Simpson.

Lemma 7.1 (Simpson, the page 729 in [50]) *The following inequality holds:*

$$\Delta \log |f|_h^2 \leq \frac{-\bigl|[f, f^\dagger]\bigr|_h^2}{|f|_h^2}.$$

▮

Due to the condition 1 in Condition 7.1, we have the endomorphisms $f_{0\,a\,|\,Q} \in End(E_{a\,|\,Q})$. We have the $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition of $E_{a\,|\,Q}$:

$$E_{a\,|\,Q} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,a\,|\,Q})} \mathbb{E}(f_{0\,a\,|\,Q}, \alpha).$$

We have the natural bijection $\mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,|\,Q}) \simeq \bigl\{(a,\alpha) \bigm| a \in S_0,\ \alpha \in \mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,a\,|\,Q})\bigr\}$. We pick a total order $\leq_2$ on $\mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,a\,|\,Q})$ on each a. Then we obtain the total order $\leq_3$ on $\mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,|\,Q})$, which is given by the lexicographic order of $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$.

We obtain the filtration $F^{(1)}$ on $E_{|Q}$ defined as follows:

$$F^{(1)}_{(a,\alpha)}(E_{|Q}) = \bigoplus_{(b,\beta) \leq_3 (a,\alpha)} \mathbb{E}(f_{0\,b\,|\,Q}, \beta).$$

Let $H_{(a,\alpha)}$ denote the orthogonal complement of $F^{(1)}_{<(a,\alpha)}$ in $F^{(1)}_{(a,\alpha)}$. We have the following:

$$E'_{a\,|\,Q} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,a\,|\,Q})} H_{(a,\alpha)}.$$

We put as follows:

$$\tilde{\rho}_Q := \bigoplus_{(a,\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}p(f_{0\,|\,Q})} \alpha \cdot id_{H_{(a,\alpha)}}.$$

Lemma 7.2 *There exists a good constant C and ϵ_0 satisfying the following:*

$$\big|\tilde{\rho}_Q - \rho'_{|Q}\big|_h \leq C \cdot |z(Q)|^{\epsilon_0}.$$

Proof It follows from the condition 2 in Condition 7.1. ▮

Corollary 7.1 *There exists a good constant A_2 satisfying the following:*

$$|\tilde{\rho}_Q|_h^2 \leq A_2.$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 7.2. ▮

We decompose as $f_{|Q} := \tilde{\rho}_Q \cdot z(Q)^{-1} + g_Q$. Then we have the following equality:

$$|f_{|Q}|_h^2 = |\tilde{\rho}_Q|_h^2 \cdot |z(Q)|^{-2} + |g_Q|_h^2.$$

Lemma 7.3 *There exists a good constant A_1 satisfying the following:*

$$\big|\big[f_{|Q},\ f_{|Q}^{\dagger}\big]\big|_h \geq A_1 \cdot |g_Q|^2. \tag{114}$$

Proof It can be shown by an elementary linear algebraic argument. ▮

7.1.3 Step 1 of the proof of (I)

Lemma 7.4 *There exist good constants A_3 and A_4 satisfying the following:*

For any point $Q \in \Delta^*(R)$, one of the following holds:

- $|f(Q)|_h^2 \leq A_3 \cdot |z(Q)|^{-2}$.
- $\Delta \log |f|_h^2(Q) \leq -A_4 \cdot |f|_h^2(Q)$.

Proof Assume that $|f_{|Q}|_h^2 \geq 2 \cdot A_2 \cdot |z(Q)|^{-2}$. Then we obtain $|g_Q|_h^2 \geq 2^{-1} \cdot |f_{|Q}|_h^2$. Hence we obtain the following:

$$\big(\Delta \log |f|_h^2\big)(Q) \leq \frac{-\big|\big[f_{|Q},\ f_{|Q}^{\dagger}\big]\big|_h^2}{|f_{|Q}|_h^2} \leq \frac{-A_1^2 \cdot \big|g_Q\big|_h^4}{|f_{|Q}|_h^2} \leq \frac{-A_1^2}{4} \cdot |f_{|Q}|_h^2.$$

Thus we may take $A_3 = 2A_2$ and $A_4 = 4^{-1}A_1^2$. ▮

Let η and B be positive numbers. We put as follows:

$$m_{\eta,B} := \frac{B}{(|z| - \eta)^2 \cdot (|z| - R)^2}.$$

It is a C^∞-function on the region $\big\{z \,\big|\, \eta < |z| < R\big\}$. Note that $m_{\eta,B}$ is ∞ on the boundary $\big\{z \,\big|\, |z| = \eta\big\} \cup \big\{z \,\big|\, |z| = R\big\}$.

Lemma 7.5 *Let us take a positive number B satisfying the following inequalities:*

$$B \geq \frac{4R^2}{A_4}, \quad B > A_3 \cdot R^2.$$

In particular, B is a good constant. Then we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\Delta \log m_{\eta,B} \geq -A_4 \cdot m_{\eta,B}, \quad m_{\eta,B} \geq A_3 \cdot |z|^{-2}.$$

Proof We have the following formula:

$$\Delta \log m_{\eta,B} = \frac{-2\eta}{|z|\cdot\bigl(|z|-\eta\bigr)^2} + \frac{-2R}{|z|\cdot\bigl(|z|-R\bigr)^2} = \frac{-2}{B}\Bigl(\frac{\bigl(|z|-R\bigr)^2}{|z|}\cdot\eta + \frac{\bigl(|z|-\eta\bigr)^2}{|z|}\cdot R\Bigr)\cdot m_{\eta,B}. \qquad (115)$$

From $\eta < |z| < R$, we have the following inequalities:

$$\frac{\eta}{|z|} < 1, \quad (|z|-R)^2 \leq R^2, \quad \frac{(|z|-\eta)^2}{|z|} \leq |z|-\eta \leq R.$$

Thus we have the following inequality:

$$\frac{\eta}{|z|}\cdot\bigl(|z|-R\bigr)^2 + \frac{\bigl(|z|-\eta\bigr)^2}{|z|}\cdot R \leq 2R^2. \qquad (116)$$

From (115) and (116), we obtain the following inequality on the region $\bigl\{z \,\big|\, \eta < |z| < R\bigr\}$:

$$\Delta \log m_{\eta,B} \geq -\frac{4}{B}\cdot R^2 \cdot m_{\eta,B}.$$

For any $B \geq \frac{4R^2}{A_4}$ and for any $\eta > 0$, we obtain the first inequality on the region $\{\eta < |z| < R\}$.

We also have the following inequalities:

$$m_{\eta,B} = \frac{B}{(|z|-\eta)^2\cdot(|z|-R)^2} \geq \frac{A_3\cdot R^2}{(|z|-\eta)^2\cdot(|z|-R)^2} \geq \frac{A_3}{(|z|-\eta)^2} \geq \frac{A_3}{|z|^2}.$$

Hence we obtain the second inequality. ∎

We put $S_1 := \bigl\{z \in \Delta^*(R) \,\big|\, |f(z)|_h^2 > m_{\eta,B}(z)\bigr\}$.

Lemma 7.6 *The set S_1 is empty. In other words, we have the inequality $|f(z)|_h^2 \leq m_{\eta,B}(z)$ for any point $z \in \Delta^*(R)$ such that $|z| > \eta$.*

Proof Assume that S_1 is not empty, and we will derive a contradiction. On the region S_1, we have the inequality $|f|_h^2 > m_{\eta,B} \geq A_3 \cdot |z|^{-2}$. Hence we have $\Delta \log |f|_h^2 \leq -A_4 \cdot |f|_h^2$ due to Lemma 7.4. Then we obtain the following inequality on S_1:

$$\Delta \log\bigl(|f|_h^2/m_{\eta,B}\bigr) \leq -A_4 \cdot \bigl(|f|_h^2 - m_{\eta,B}\bigr) < 0.$$

It implies that the function $\log\bigl(|f|_h^2/m_{\eta,B}\bigr)$ cannot take the maximal in the region S_1.

Let $\bar{S}_1$ denote the closure of S_1 in $\boldsymbol{C}$. Since we have $m_\eta = \infty$ on the boundary $\{|z| = \eta\} \cup \{|z| = R\}$, the intersection of the sets $\bar{S}_1$ and $\bigl\{z \,\big|\, |z| = \eta\bigr\} \cup \bigl\{|z| = R\bigr\}$ is empty. Hence we have $|f|_h^2 = m_{\eta,B}$ on the boundary of $\bar{S}_1$. Hence we obtain $|f|_h^2 \leq m_{\eta,B}$ on S_1, but it contradicts the definition of S_1. Hence we obtain $S_1 = \emptyset$. ∎

When we take a limit $\eta \to 0$, we obtain the inequality on $\Delta^*(R)$:

$$\bigl|f(z)\bigr|_h^2 \leq \frac{B}{|z|^2\cdot\bigl(|z|-R\bigr)^2}.$$

Hence, we have arrived at the following:

Lemma 7.7 *For any R_3 such that $R_1 < R_3 < R$, there exists a good constant A_5 such that the following inequality holds on $\Delta^*(R_3)$:*

$$\bigl|f(z)\bigr|_h^2 \leq \frac{A_5}{|z|^2}.$$

∎

7.1.4 Step 2 for the proof of (I)

We put as follows: $k := \log |f|_h^2 - \log\bigl(\xi \cdot |z|^{-2}\bigr)$. Then we have the following:

$$k(Q) = \log\Bigl(\frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot |f_{|Q}|^2\Bigr) = \log\Bigl(\frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot \bigl(|\tilde{\rho}_Q|_h^2 \cdot |z(Q)|^{-2} + |g_Q|_h^2\bigr)\Bigr).$$

We put $b_Q := |\tilde{\rho}_Q|^2 - \xi$.

Lemma 7.8 *We have a good constant A_6 such that $|b_Q| \leq A_6 \cdot |z(Q)|^{\epsilon_0}$.*

Proof This is a reformulation of Lemma 7.2. ▮

Lemma 7.9 *There exists a good constant A_7 satisfying the following for any point $Q \in \Delta^*(R_3)$:*

$$A_7 \cdot \Bigl(\xi^{-1} \cdot b_Q + \frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot |g_Q|_h^2\Bigr) \leq k(Q) \leq \xi^{-1} \cdot b_Q + \frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot |g_Q|_h^2. \tag{117}$$

Proof We have the following description:

$$k(Q) = \log\Bigl(1 + \xi^{-1} \cdot b_Q + \frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot |g_Q|_h^2\Bigr).$$

Then the right inequality is obvious. We have only to obtain the left inequality.

Recall we have obtained the following estimate on $\Delta^*(R_3)$ in Step 1:

$$|g_Q|_h^2 \leq |f_{|Q}|_h^2 \leq A_5 \cdot |z(Q)|^{-2}.$$

Hence we have the following inequality:

$$0 \leq \frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi} \cdot |g_Q|_h^2 \leq \frac{A_5}{\xi}.$$

Then we obtain the left inequality for some good constant, for example, by using the convexity of the logarithmic function. ▮

We will show Lemma 7.10 later.

Lemma 7.10 *There exists a good constant A_8 satisfying the following:*

$$k \leq A_8 \cdot \Bigl(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_3}\Bigr)^{-2}.$$

Lemma 7.11 *Lemma* 7.10 *implies the claim (I) of Proposition* 7.1.

Proof Assume that we have shown Lemma 7.10, then we obtain the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_1)$:

$$|f_0 - \rho'|_h^2 = b_Q + |z(Q)|^2 \cdot |g_Q|_h^2 \leq \xi \cdot A_7^{-1} \cdot k \leq \xi \cdot A_7^{-1} \cdot A_8 \cdot \Bigl(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_3}\Bigr)^{-2}.$$

It implies the desired inequality (112) in (I). Thus we have reduced the proof of the claim (I) to Lemma 7.10. ▮

7.1.5 Proof of Lemma 7.10

Let us prove Lemma 7.10. There exists a good constant A_{10} satisfying the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_3)$:

$$\xi^{-1}\cdot A_6\cdot|z|^{\epsilon_0}\leq\frac{1}{2}A_{10}\left(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_3}\right)^{-2}.$$

Here A_6 appeared in Lemma 7.8.

Take a good constant A_{11} satisfying the following:

$$A_{11}<\frac{A_1^2\cdot\xi^2}{4\cdot A_5},\quad A_{11}<\frac{6}{A_{10}}. \tag{118}$$

The first condition will be used in Lemma 7.12 and the second condition will be used to obtain the inequality (121).

Lemma 7.12 *One of the following holds:*

- $k(Q)<A_{10}\cdot\left(\log\frac{|z(Q)|}{R_3}\right)^{-2}$
- $(\Delta k)(Q)<-A_{11}\cdot k(Q)^2\cdot|z(Q)|^{-2}$.

Proof Assume $k(Q)\geq A_{10}\cdot\big(-\log\frac{|z(Q)|}{R_3}\big)^{-2}$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\frac{1}{2}k(Q)\geq\xi^{-1}\cdot A_6\cdot|z|^{\epsilon_0}\geq\xi^{-1}\cdot|b_Q|.$$

Namely we obtain the following:

$$k(Q)-\xi^{-1}\cdot b_Q\geq\frac{k(Q)}{2}.$$

By using the right inequality in (117), we obtain the following inequality:

$$\frac{|z(Q)|^2}{\xi}\cdot|g_Q|_h^2\geq\frac{k(Q)}{2}.$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$-|g_Q|_h^4\leq\frac{-\xi^2}{4\cdot|z(Q)|^4}k(Q)^2. \tag{119}$$

Note the following:

$$\Delta k=\Delta\log|f|_h^2\leq\frac{-\big|[f,f^\dagger]\big|_h^2}{|f|_h^2}.$$

Then we obtain the following inequality by using Lemma 7.7, the inequality (114), the left inequality in (118), and the inequality (119):

$$(\Delta k)(Q)\leq-A_1^2\cdot\frac{\xi^2}{|z(Q)|^4\cdot 4}\cdot k(Q)^2\cdot\frac{|z(Q)|^2}{A_5}=\frac{-A_1^2\cdot\xi^2\cdot k(Q)^2}{4\cdot A_5\cdot|z(Q)|^2}<-A_{11}\cdot\frac{k(Q)^2}{|z(Q)|}.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

For any positive numbers ϵ and B, we put as follows:

$$p_{B,\epsilon}=B\cdot\left(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_3}\right)^{-2}+\epsilon\cdot\left(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_3}\right).$$

Lemma 7.13 *We put $B = 6 \cdot A_{11}^{-1}$. We have the following inequalities:*

$$\Delta p_{B,\epsilon} \geq -A_{11} \cdot \frac{p_{B,\epsilon}^2}{|z|^2}, \qquad p_{B,\epsilon} > A_{10} \cdot \Bigl(-\log \frac{|z|}{R_3}\Bigr)^{-2}. \tag{120}$$

Proof We have the following formula, where we use the real coordinate $z = r \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}$:

$$\Delta p_{B,\epsilon} = -\Bigl(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r}\Bigr)\Bigl(\frac{2B}{(-\log r/R_3)^3 \cdot r}\Bigr) = \frac{-6B}{(-\log r/R_3)^4 \cdot r^2} \geq \frac{-6p_{B,\epsilon}^2}{B \cdot r^2}.$$

Here we have used the inequality:

$$\frac{p_{B,\epsilon}^2}{r^2} \geq \frac{B^2}{(-\log r/R_3)^2 \cdot r^2}.$$

Since we put $B = 6 \cdot A_{11}^{-1}$, we obtain the first inequality in (120).

Note that we have the following, due to the second inequality in (118):

$$B = 6 \cdot A_{11}^{-1} > A_{10}. \tag{121}$$

Thus we obtain the second equality in (120). ▮

We put $S_2 := \bigl\{Q \bigm| k(Q) > p_\epsilon(Q)\bigr\}$.

Lemma 7.14 *The set S_2 is empty. In other words, we have $k(Q) \leq p_\epsilon(Q)$ for any point $Q \in \Delta^*$.*

Proof We assume that S_2 is not empty, and we will derive a contradiction. Let Q be a point of S_2, and then we have the inequality $k(Q) > p_\epsilon(Q) \geq A_{10} \cdot \bigl(-\log \frac{|z(Q)|}{R_3}\bigr)^{-2}$. Then we obtain the following inequality due to Lemma 7.12:

$$\Delta k(Q) < -A_{11} \frac{|k(Q)|^2}{|z(Q)|^2}.$$

Hence we have the following inequality:

$$\Delta(k - p_\epsilon)(Q) < -A_{11} \frac{k(Q)^2 - p_\epsilon(Q)^2}{|z(Q)|^2} < 0.$$

It means that the function $k - p_\epsilon$ does not have any maximal point in the region S_2. Since we have $p_\epsilon = \infty$ on the boundary $\{|z| = 0\} \cup \{|z| = R_3\}$, the intersection of the sets S_2 and $\{|z| = 0\} \cup \{|z| = R_3\}$ is empty. Hence we have $k(Q) = p_\epsilon(Q)$ on the boundary of S_2. Thus we obtain the inequality $k \leq p_\epsilon$ on the region S_2, which contradicts the definition of S_2. ▮

Let us return to the proof of Lemma 7.10. We obtain $k(Q) \leq p_{B,\epsilon}$ for any positive number ϵ due to Lemma 7.14. Thus we obtain the following inequality for a good constant:

$$k \leq B \cdot \Bigl(-\log \frac{|z|}{R_3}\Bigr)^{-2}.$$

Therefore the proof of Lemma 7.10 and the proof of the claim (I) are accomplished. ▮

7.1.6 The proof of (II)

For any element $l \in \bigoplus_{a \leq_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a)$, the adjoint $\mathrm{ad}(l)$ induces the endomorphism of $\bigoplus_{a <_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a)$, which we denote by F_l. Recall that we put $f_0 = f \cdot z$.

Lemma 7.15 *There exist good constants R_4 and A_{14} such that F_{f_0} is invertible on $\Delta^*(R_4)$, and the norms of F_{f_0} and $F_{f_0}^{-1}$ are dominated by A_{14}.*

Proof We put $\tilde{g} := f_0 - \rho'$, which is a section of $\bigoplus_{a\leq_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a)$. Then we have the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_1)$ due to the claim (I):

$$|\tilde{g}|_h \leq C_1 \cdot \left(-\log\frac{|z|}{R}\right)^{-1}. \tag{122}$$

Hence the norm of the endomorphism $F_{\tilde{g}}$ is dominated by $A_{13} \cdot \bigl(-\log(|z| \cdot R^{-1})\bigr)^{-1}$ for a good constant A_{13}. On the other hand, the endomorphism $F_{\rho'}$ is invertible and the norms of $F_{\rho'}$ and $F_{\rho'}^{-1}$ are dominated by a good constant A_{12}. Thus we obtain Lemma 7.15. ∎

We put $q := \rho - \rho'$, which is an element of $\bigoplus_{a<_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a)$.

Lemma 7.16 *There exists a good constant* A_{15} *such that* $|q|_h \leq A_{15} \cdot \bigl(-\log(|z|\cdot R^{-1})\bigr)^{-1}$ *on the region* $\Delta^*(R_4)$.

Proof We have the following equality by using $[\rho', \rho'] = 0$:

$$0 = [f_0, \rho] = [f_0, \rho' + q] = F_{f_0}(q) + [\rho' + \tilde{g}, \rho'] = F_{f_0}(q) + [\tilde{g}, \rho'].$$

Then we obtain Lemma 7.16 by using Lemma 7.15 and (122). ∎

Lemma 7.17 *There exist good constants* R_5 *and* A_{16} *such that the following inequality holds on the region* $\Delta^*(R_5)$*:*

$$\bigl|[\rho, f^{\dagger}]\bigr|_h^2 \geq A_{16} \cdot |q|_h^2 \cdot |z|^{-2}.$$

Proof We have the following equality by a direct calculation:

$$[\rho, f^{\dagger}] = [\rho', f^{\dagger}] + [q,\, \bar{z}^{-1}\cdot\bar{\rho}'] + [q,\, \bar{z}^{-1}\cdot\tilde{g}^{\dagger}].$$

Here we put $\bar{\rho}' = \bigoplus_{a\in S_0} \bar{a} \cdot id_{E'_a}$, and we have used the relation $\rho'^{\,\dagger} = \bar{\rho}'$. Note the following:

$$\bigl[\rho', f^{\dagger}\bigr] \in \bigoplus_{a>_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a), \qquad \bigl[q,\, \bar{z}^{-1}\cdot\bar{\rho}'\bigr] \in \bigoplus_{a<_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a).$$

There exists good constants $C > 0$ and $C' > 0$ satisfying the following:

$$\bigl|[q, \bar{z}^{-1}\cdot\tilde{g}^{\dagger}]\bigr|_h \leq C' \cdot |z|^{-1} \cdot |\operatorname{ad}(\tilde{g})|_h \cdot |q|_h \leq C \cdot \bigl(-|z|\log\tfrac{|z|}{R}\bigr)^{-1} \cdot |q|_h,$$

$$\bigl|[q, \bar{z}^{-1}\bar{\rho}']\bigr|_h \geq C \cdot |z|^{-1}|q|_h.$$

In all, we obtain Lemma 7.17. ∎

Recall the following inequality due to Simpson (in the page 731 of [50]):

$$\Delta \log|\rho|_h^2 \leq \frac{-\bigl|[\rho, f^{\dagger}]\bigr|_h^2}{|\rho|_h^2}. \tag{123}$$

Lemma 7.18 *There exist good constants* R_6 *and* A_{17} *such that the following inequality holds on* $\Delta^*(R_6)$*:*

$$\Delta\log|\rho|_h^2 \leq -A_{17} \cdot |q|_h^2 \cdot |z|^{-2}.$$

Proof It follows from (123) and Lemma 7.17. ∎

Since we have $|\rho|_h^2 = \xi + |q|_h^2$, we obtain the following inequality on $\Delta^*(R_6)$:

$$\Delta\log(1 + \xi^{-1}\cdot|q|_h^2) \leq -A_{17} \cdot |q|_h^2 \cdot |z|^{-2}. \tag{124}$$

Lemma 7.19 *There exists a good constant* A_{18} *such that the following holds:*

$$A_{18}\cdot\xi^{-1}\cdot|q|_h^2 \leq \log(1 + \xi^{-1}\cdot|q|_h^2) \leq \xi^{-1}\cdot|q|_h^2. \tag{125}$$

Proof The right in the inequality (125) is clear. Since we have $|q|_h \leq A_{15} \cdot \bigl(-\log(|z| \cdot R^{-1})\bigr)^{-1}$ on $\Delta^*(R_6)$ due to Lemma 7.16, we have the following:

$$|q|_h^2 \cdot \xi^{-1} \leq \xi^{-1} \cdot A_{15}^2 \cdot \Bigl(-\log\frac{|z|}{R}\Bigr)^{-2}. \tag{126}$$

In particular, we have a good constant $C > 0$ such that $0 \leq |q|_h^2 \cdot \xi^{-1} \leq C$ on $\Delta^*(R_6)$. Thus there exists a good constant for the left inequality in (125). ∎

We put $k := \log(1 + |z|^2 \cdot \xi^{-1} \cdot |q|_h^2)$.

Lemma 7.20 *There exists a good constant* A_{19} *such that the following holds:*

$$\Delta k \leq -A_{19} \cdot k \cdot |z|^{-2}. \tag{127}$$

Proof It follows from (124) and the left inequality in (125). ∎

Lemma 7.21 *We have the following inequality on* $\Delta^*(R_6)$*:*

$$k \leq |z|^2 \cdot \xi^{-1} \cdot |q|_h^2 \leq A_{15} \cdot \xi^{-1} \cdot \bigl(-\log(|z| \cdot R^{-1})\bigr)^{-2}.$$

Proof It immediately follows from the right inequality in (125) and (126). ∎

Corollary 7.2 *There exists a good constant* A_{20} *such that* $k \leq A_{20}$*.* ∎

For positive numbers B, ϵ and u, we put as follows:

$$p_{B,\epsilon,u} := B \cdot \Bigl(|z|^u + \epsilon \cdot \Bigl(-\log\frac{|z|}{R}\Bigr)\Bigr).$$

It is easy to check $\Delta p_{B,\epsilon,u} = -u^2 \cdot |z|^{u-2} \cdot B$.

Lemma 7.22

- *Take* $u > 0$ *satisfying* $u^2 < A_{19}$*. Then we have the following inequality:*

$$\Delta p_{B,\epsilon,u} > -A_{19} \cdot |z|^{-2} \cdot |z|^u \cdot B > -A_{19} \cdot |z|^{-2} \cdot p_{B,\epsilon,u}. \tag{128}$$

- *Fix* $u > 0$*. Take* $B > 0$ *as* $B \cdot R_6^u > A_{20}$*. Then we obtain the following:*

$$p_{B,\epsilon,u}(R_6) = B \cdot \Bigl(R_6^u + \epsilon \cdot \Bigl(-\log\frac{|z|}{R_6}\Bigr)\Bigr) > A_{20} > k(R_6). \tag{129}$$

∎

Let us fix good constants u and B as in Lemma 7.22. We use the notation p_ϵ instead of $p_{B,\epsilon,u}$. Then we obtain the following inequality from (127) and (128):

$$\Delta(k - p_\epsilon) < -\frac{A_{19}}{|z|^2} \cdot (k - p_\epsilon). \tag{130}$$

We put $S_3 := \bigl\{Q \in \Delta^*(R_0) \bigm| k(Q) - p_\epsilon > 0\bigr\}$.

Lemma 7.23 *The set* S_3 *is empty. In other words, we have* $k(Q) \leq p_\epsilon(Q)$ *for any point* $Q \in \Delta^*$*.*

Proof Assume that S_3 is not empty, and we will derive a contradiction. The function $k - p_\epsilon$ has no maximal point in the region S_3 due to the inequality (130). Since we have $p_\epsilon(R_6) > k(R_6)$ due to the inequality (129), and since we have $p_\epsilon(0) = \infty$ by definition, the intersection of the sets S_3 and $\{|z| = 0\} \cup \{|z| = R_6\}$ is empty. Hence we have $k = p_\epsilon$ on the boundary of the closure $\bar{S}_3$. Hence we obtain $k \leq p_\epsilon$ on S_3, which is a contradiction. Hence the set S_3 is empty. ∎

When we take limit $\epsilon \to 0$, we obtain the inequality $k \leq B \cdot r^u$ on $\Delta^*(R_6)$. Then there exists a good constant A_{21} such that the following inequality holds on $\Delta^*(R_6)$:

$$|q|_h \leq A_{21} \cdot |z|^u.$$

Thus the proof of the claim (II) is accomplished. ∎

7.1.7 Some consequences and the asymptotic orthogonality

Corollary 7.3 *For any $R_1 < R$, there exists a good constant C such that the following holds on $\Delta^*(R_1)$:*

$$|f_0 - \rho|_h \leq C \cdot \Bigl(- \log \frac{|z|}{R} \Bigr)^{-1}.$$

Proof It follows from the estimate of $q = \rho - \rho'$ and (I) in Proposition 7.1. ■

We have the decomposition $f_0 = \sum_{a \geq_1 b} \tilde{f}_{0,a,b}$, where $\tilde{f}_{0,a,b} \in Hom(E'_a, E'_b)$.

Corollary 7.4 *There exist good constants $C > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following holds:*

- $|\tilde{f}_{0\,a\,b}|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon}$ *in the case $a \neq b$.*
- $|\tilde{f}_{0\,a\,a} - a \cdot id_{E'_a}|_h \leq C \cdot \Bigl(- \log \dfrac{|z|}{R}\Bigr)^{-1}$.

Proof The second inequality immediately follows from (I) in Proposition 7.1. Due to the commutativity $[f_0, \rho] = 0$, we have $[f_0, \rho'] + [f_0, q] = 0$. We have the following:

$$[f_0, \rho'] = \sum_{a >_1 b} (b - a) \cdot \tilde{f}_{0\,a\,b}.$$

On the other hand, we have the estimate

$$\bigl|[f_0, q]\bigr|_h \leq C \cdot |f_0|_h \cdot |q|_h \leq C'|z|^{\epsilon_2}.$$

Hence we obtain the estimates for $\tilde{f}_{0\,a\,b}$. ■

We have the decomposition $f_0^\dagger = \sum_{a,b} \tilde{f}^\dagger_{0\,a\,b}$, where $\tilde{f}^\dagger_{0\,a\,b} \in Hom(E'_a, E'_b)$.

Corollary 7.5 *There exists good constants C and ϵ such that the following holds:*

- $|\tilde{f}^\dagger_{0\,a\,b}|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon}$ *in the case $a \neq b$.*
- $|\tilde{f}^\dagger_{0\,a\,a} - \bar{a} \cdot id_{E'_a}|_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$.

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 7.4. ■

We put $\bar{\rho} := \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} \bar{a} \cdot id_{E_a}$. We also put $\bar{\rho}' := \bigoplus_{a \in S_0} \bar{a} \cdot id_{E'_a}$. Note that $\bar{\rho}'$ is adjoint of ρ', and that $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}' \in \bigoplus_{a <_1 b} Hom(E'_b, E'_a)$.

Lemma 7.24 *There exists good constants C', R' and ϵ' such that the following holds on $\Delta^*(R')$:*

$$\bigl|\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}'\bigr|_h \leq C' \cdot |z|^{\epsilon'}.$$

Proof The argument is similar to the proof of Corollary 7.4. We have the following formula:

$$0 = [\bar{\rho}, \rho] = [\bar{\rho}, \rho'] + [\bar{\rho}, q] = \bigl[\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}', \rho'\bigr] + [\bar{\rho}, q].$$

There exist good positive constants R'', C'', C''' and ϵ'' satisfying the following inequalities on $\Delta^*(R'')$:

$$\bigl|[\bar{\rho}, q]\bigr|_h \leq C'' \cdot |z|^{\epsilon''}, \qquad \bigl|\bigl[\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}', \rho'\bigr]\bigr|_h \geq C'' \cdot \bigl|\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}'\bigr|_h.$$

Thus we are done. ■

Corollary 7.6 *There exist good positive constants C' and R' such that the following holds on $\Delta^*(R')$:*

$$\bigl|f_0^\dagger - \bar{\rho}\bigr|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{-1} \cdot \Bigl(- \log \frac{|z|}{R}\Bigr)^{-1}.$$

Proof We have $f_0^\dagger - \bar\rho = (f_0^\dagger - \bar\rho') + (\bar\rho' - \bar\rho) = (f_0^\dagger - \rho'^{\,\dagger}) + (\bar\rho' - \bar\rho)$. Then we obtain the result from (I) in Proposition 7.1 and Lemma 7.24. ▮

In general, let us consider an element $g \in \bigoplus_a End(E_a)$. Then we have the decomposition:

$$g = \sum_{a \geq_1 b} g_{a\,b}, \qquad g_{a\,b} \in Hom(E'_a, E'_b).$$

Lemma 7.25 *We have the estimate* $|g_{a\,b}|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon} \cdot |g|_h$ *for* $a \neq b$*.*

Proof We have $0 = [g, \rho] = [g, \rho'] + [g, q]$. We have an estimate $\big|[g, q]\big|_h \leq C' \cdot |g|_h \cdot |z|^{\epsilon'}$ on $\Delta^*(R')$ for some good positive constants C', ϵ' and R'. On the other hand, we have

$$[g, \rho'] = \sum_{a >_1 b} (b - a) \cdot g_{a,b}.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

For the endomorphism g above, we also obtain the adjoint $g^\dagger \in End(E)$, and we have the decomposition:

$$g^\dagger = \sum_{a \leq_1 b} (g^\dagger)_{a\,b}, \qquad (g^\dagger)_{a\,b} \in Hom(E'_a, E'_b).$$

Lemma 7.26 *We have* $|(g^\dagger)_{a\,b}|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon} \cdot |g|_h$ *if* $a \neq b$*.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 7.25. ▮

We have the following asymptotic orthogonality.

Proposition 7.2 *There exist good constants* $C_3 > 0$*,* $\epsilon_3 > 0$ *and* $R_{10} > 0$*. Let* a_1 *and* a_2 *be elements of* S_0 *such that* $a_1 \neq a_2$*. Then* E_{a_1} *and* E_{a_2} *are* $|z|^{\epsilon_3}$*-asymptotically orthogonal. More precisely, let* v_i *be* C^∞*-sections of* E_i*. Then it holds* $\big|(v_1, v_2)_h\big| \leq C_3 \cdot |z|^{\epsilon_3} \cdot |v_1|_h \cdot |v_2|_h$ *on* $\Delta^*(R_{10})$*.*

Proof Let v be a C^∞-section of E_a. We have the following decomposition:

$$v = \sum_{b \leq_1 a} v_b, \qquad v_b \in C^\infty\big(X - D, E'_b\big).$$

We have the equalities $\rho(v) = a \cdot v = \sum_{b \leq a} a \cdot v_b$. On the other hand, we have the following equalities:

$$\rho(v) = \rho'(v) + q(v) = \sum_{b \leq_1 a} b \cdot v_b + q(v).$$

Hence we obtain the following:

$$\sum_{b <_1 a} (a - b) \cdot v_b = q(v).$$

Therefore there exists a good constant A_{22} such that the following holds for any v:

$$|v_b|_h \leq A_{22} \cdot |z|^u \cdot |v|_h.$$

Let v be a C^∞-section of E_a and w be a C^∞-section of E_c such that $c < a$. Then we have the following:

$$|(v, w)_h| = \Big|\sum_{b \leq_1 a} (v_b, w)_h\Big| = \Big|\sum_{b \leq_1 c} (v_b, w)_h\Big| \leq \sum_{b \leq_1 c} |v_b|_h \cdot |w|_h \leq A_{22} \cdot |z|^u \cdot \sum_{b \leq_1 c} |v|_h \cdot |w|_h.$$

Hence there exists a good constant $A_{23} > 0$ such that the following holds:

$$|(v, w)_h| \leq A_{23} \cdot |z|^u \cdot |v| \cdot |w|.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

7.2 The KMS-structure of tame harmonic bundles on a punctured disc

7.2.1 Prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$

We put $X = \Delta$ and $D = \{O\}$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. We have the deformed holomorphic bundle $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda} - \mathcal{D}^{\lambda}$ with the metric h. Let us recall the result on the prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. (See the section 10 of [49] and the section 3 of [50]. See also the subsubsection 4.3.1–4.3.3 in [38].)

1. For any real number $b \in \boldsymbol{R}$, the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module ${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is locally free.
2. For any real numbers $a < b$, we have the canonical inclusion ${}_a\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \longrightarrow {}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules. Then we obtain the parabolic filtration of ${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$. Namely we put $F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \mathrm{Im}({}_a\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} \longrightarrow {}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$. Then we have the following inclusions for any $b - 1 \leq a \leq b$:
$$0 = F_{b-1}({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \subset F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \subset F_b({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = {}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}.$$
3. We put as follows:
$$F_{<a}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \sum_{c<a} F_c(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \bigcup_{c<a} F_c(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \quad \mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \frac{F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})}{F_{<a}({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})}.$$
If $a \leq b < a+1$, we have the canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}_a\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. Hence we omit to denote b in this case.

   On the contrary, if $b < a$ or $b \geq a+1$, then we have $\mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = 0$ by definition.
4. Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over X compatible with parabolic filtration on D. We put $b_i := \deg^F(v_i)$. We put $v'_i := |z|^{b_i} \cdot v_i$, and then we obtain the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v'} := (v'_i)$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda} - \mathcal{D}^{\lambda}$. Then $\boldsymbol{v'}$ is adapted up to log order
5. $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ is logarithmic in the following sense: if f is a holomorphic section of ${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, then $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda} f$ is a holomorphic section of ${}_{b+1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \otimes \Omega^{1,0} = {}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \otimes \Omega^{1,0}(\log O)$. In particular, we obtain the residue $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}) \in \mathrm{End}({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$, which preserves the parabolic filtration F.

We have the $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition of ${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$ for $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D})$:
$${}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C}} \mathbb{E}\big({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}, \alpha\big).$$

Lemma 7.27 *The decomposition $\mathbb{E}$ and the parabolic filtration F is compatible.*

Proof Since $F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ is stable under the action of $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$, we have only to apply Lemma 2.4. ∎

For any $u = (a, \alpha) \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$ and for any b such that $a \leq b < a+1$, we put as follows:
$$\mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_u(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \alpha) = \mathrm{Gr}^F_a\, \mathbb{E}\big({}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}, \alpha\big).$$
It is independent of a choice of b.

For any $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$, we have the induced morphism $\mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_u(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}))$ on $Gr^{F,\mathbb{E}}_u(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. The nilpotent part is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_u$. Then we obtain the weight filtration W of $\mathcal{N}_u$.

7.2.2 KMS-spectrum

Definition 7.2 *For a harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$, the set $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ is defined as follows:*
$$\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \big\{u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, \dim \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_u(\mathcal{E}) \neq 0\big\}.$$
It is called the KMS-spectrum set of $\mathcal{E}$ at (λ, O). For any $u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, the number $\mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u)$ is defined as follows:
$$\mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u) := \dim \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_u(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$
It is called the multiplicity of the KMS-spectrum u. ∎

The natural morphisms $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ and $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$ are denoted by $\pi^{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\pi^{\mathfrak{e}}$. We put $\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \mathrm{Im}(\pi^{\mathfrak{p}})$ and $\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \mathrm{Im}(\pi^{\mathfrak{e}})$.

Proposition 7.3 *We have the isomorphism* $\mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_{u}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_{u+(1,-\lambda)}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$.

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}_{a}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$ and F. We put $b_i := \deg^{F}(v_i)$. We put $\tilde{v}_i := z^{-1} \cdot v_i$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := (\tilde{v}_i)$.

Lemma 7.28 $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ *gives a holomorphic frame of* ${}_{a+1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Proof We put $\tilde{v}'_i := \tilde{v}_i \cdot |z|^{b_i - 1}$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}' = (\tilde{v}_i)$. Then it is C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda} - \mathcal{D}^{\lambda}$, and it is adapted up to log order. Then $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}_{a}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ compatible with the parabolic filtration due to Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5. ▮

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 7.3. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e. $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \mathcal{A}$ holds. Then we have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \mathbb{D}\big(z^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}\big) = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \cdot \Big(\mathcal{A} - \lambda \frac{dz}{z}\Big).$$

We obtain the isomorphism ${}_{a}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} \longrightarrow {}_{a+1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$ defined by the correspondence $v_i(0) \longmapsto \tilde{v}_i(0)$. Then it induces the isomorphism:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{E},F}_{u}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{E},F}_{u+(1,-\lambda)}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Corollary 7.7 *We have the equality* $\mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u) = \mathfrak{m}\big(\lambda, u + (1, -\lambda)\big)$. ▮

We have the free $\mathbb{Z}$-action on $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$:

$$\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \quad (n, u) \longmapsto u + n \cdot (1, -\lambda).$$

It preserves the multiplicities.

Definition 7.3 *We put* $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})/\mathbb{Z}$. *Note that the multiplicity of any element* $u \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ *is naturally defined, due to Corollary* 7.7. ▮

Definition 7.4 *We put as follows:*

$$\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \big\{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \,\big|\, b - 1 < \pi^{\mathfrak{p}}(u) \leq b\big\} = \big\{u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{E},F}_{u}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \neq 0\big\}.$$

▮

We have the natural morphism $\pi : \mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 7.29 *The morphism* π *is bijective.* ▮

The restriction of $\pi^{\mathfrak{p}}$ to $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ gives the morphisms $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$. The image $\pi^{\mathfrak{p}}\big(\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\big)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{P}ar({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 7.30 *We have* $\mathcal{P}ar({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \big\{a \in \boldsymbol{R} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{a}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \neq 0\big\}$. ▮

The restriction of the morphism $\pi^{\mathfrak{e}}$ to $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ gives the morphism $\pi^{\mathfrak{e}} : \mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$. The image $\pi^{\mathfrak{e}}\big(\mathcal{KMS}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\big)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}p({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 7.31 *We have* $\mathcal{S}p({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \big\{\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, \mathbb{E}\big({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}, \alpha\big) \neq 0\big\}$. ▮

7.2.3 The functoriality of the KMS structure for pull back

Let c be a positive integer, and $\psi_c : X \longrightarrow X$ be the morphism given by $z \longmapsto z^c$.

Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over X. We put $b = -\operatorname{ord}(f)$. Assume $-1 < b \leq 0$, i.e., $f_{|O} \neq 0$ in ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|O}$.

We have the holomorphic section $\psi_c^{-1}(f)$ of $\psi_c^{-1}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ over $\mathcal{X}^\lambda - \mathcal{D}^\lambda$. Then we have $\operatorname{ord}(\psi_c^{-1}(f)) = -c \cdot b$. We put as follows:

$$\tilde{f} := z^{\nu(c\cdot b)} \cdot \psi_c^{-1}(f).$$

Then we have the following:

$$-\operatorname{ord}(\tilde{f}) = -\nu(c \cdot b) - \operatorname{ord}(\psi_c^{-1}(f)) = -\nu(c \cdot b) + c \cdot b = \kappa(c \cdot b).$$

Hence $\tilde{f}$ is a section of ${}_{\kappa(cb)}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. In particular, it gives a section of ${}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be the holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ compatible with F. We put $b_i := \deg^F(v_i)$. We put $v_i' := |z|^{b_i} \cdot v_i$ and $\boldsymbol{v}' := (v_i')$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is a C^∞-frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over $\mathcal{X}^\lambda - \mathcal{D}^\lambda$, which is adapted up to log order. For each v_i, take the holomorphic section $\tilde{v}_i$ of ${}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ as above. Then we obtain the tuple of sections $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = (\tilde{v}_i)$ of ${}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.

Lemma 7.32 *$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is a holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.*

Proof We put as follows:

$$\tilde{v}_i' := |z|^{\kappa(cb_i)}\tilde{v}_i = C_i(z) \cdot \psi_c^{-1}(v_i)'.$$

Here we have $|C_i(z)| = 1$. We obtain the tuple of the C^∞-sections $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}' = (\tilde{v}_i')$ of $\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. It is a C^∞-frame of $\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over $\mathcal{X}^\lambda - \mathcal{D}^\lambda$, and it is adapted up to log order. Hence we have only to apply Lemma 2.4. ▮

Corollary 7.8 *We have the surjective morphism $\psi_c^* : \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ given as follows:*

$$(b, \beta) \longmapsto \bigl(\kappa(c \cdot b),\ c \cdot \beta + \nu(c \cdot b) \cdot \lambda\bigr) = c \cdot (b, \beta) + \nu(c \cdot b) \cdot (-1, \lambda).$$

We have isomorphisms:

$$\operatorname{Gr}_u^{\mathbb{E},F}\bigl({}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\psi_c^*(u)=u'} \operatorname{Gr}_{u'}^{\mathbb{E},F}\bigl({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr), \qquad \operatorname{Gr}_a^F\bigl({}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\kappa(cb)=a} \operatorname{Gr}_b({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda).$$

The isomorphism are given by $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$.

Proof We have only to note that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is compatible with $\mathbb{E}$ and F. The compatibility of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and F follows from the fact that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}'$ is adapted up to log order (Lemma 2.5).

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$, namely we have $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \mathcal{A}$. Then we obtain $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^\lambda\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\tilde{A} = \psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{A} + B \cdot dz/z$, and B denotes the diagonal matrix such that $B_{j\,j} = \nu(c \cdot b_j)$. Thus we obtain the compatibility of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and the decomposition $\mathbb{E}$. ▮

Corollary 7.9 *The following holds:*

$$\mathcal{P}ar\bigl(\psi_c^{-1}(\mathcal{E})\bigr) = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda)} (c \cdot a + \mathbb{Z}).$$

▮

7.2.4 The action

Assume that c is a positive integer which is sufficiently large with respect to $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. (See Definition 2.1). We have the action of μ_c on X, given by $\omega^* z = \omega \cdot z$. It can be naturally lifted to the action on $\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. Since v_i are invariant under the action of μ_c, we have the following:

$$\omega^*\tilde{v}_i = \omega^{\nu(cb_i)} \cdot \tilde{v}_i.$$

We have the weight decomposition:

$${}^\diamond\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}_{|O} = \bigoplus_h U_h.$$

Here $\omega^* = \omega^h$ on U_h for $-c + 1 \leq h \leq 0$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 7.33 $U_h = \big\langle \tilde{v}_i \,\big|\, \nu(c \cdot b_i) = h \big\rangle$. ■

We put $S := \big\{ h \,\big|\, -c+1 \leq h \leq 0,\ U_h \neq 0 \big\}$. Then we have $S = \big\{ \nu(c \cdot b) \,\big|\, b \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \big\}$. Since c is sufficiently large with respect to $\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, any element $b \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ is uniquely determined by the number $\nu(c \cdot b) \in S$. Thus we have the map $\varphi : S \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ given by the following correspondence:

$$\nu(c \cdot b) \longmapsto \kappa(c \cdot b).$$

Let us consider the filtration F' given as follows:

$$F'_{\tilde{b}} := \bigoplus_{\substack{h \in S, \\ \varphi(h) \leq \tilde{b}}} U_h.$$

Lemma 7.34 *We have* $F'_b({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = F_b({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$.

Proof It follows from the following equalities:

$$F_b({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \big\langle \tilde{v}_i \,\big|\, \kappa(c \cdot b_i) \leq b \big\rangle = F'_b({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

Thus we are done. ■

Corollary 7.10 *The decomposition* ${}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} = \bigoplus_h U_h$ *gives a splitting of the parabolic filtration in the following sense:*

$$F_b = \bigoplus_{\substack{h \in S \\ \varphi(h) \leq b}} U_h.$$

In particular, U_h *is naturally isomorphic to* $\mathrm{Gr}_b({}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$ $(\varphi(h) = b)$. ■

7.2.5 Descent of the frame

On the other hand, we can descend the equivariant frame. Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, such that $\omega^*(f) = \omega^h \cdot f$ for some integer h such that $-c < h \leq 0$. We put $f_1 := z^{-h} \cdot f$, and then we have $\omega^*(f_1) = f_1$. Hence f_1 induces the holomorphic section $\tilde{f}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $X - D$. We have the following:

$$-\operatorname{ord}(\tilde{f}) = -c^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(f_1) = c^{-1} \cdot \big(h - \operatorname{ord}(f)\big) \leq 0.$$

Hence $\tilde{f}$ gives a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^{\diamond}\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ satisfying the following:

- It is equivariant in the sense $\omega^* \tilde{v}_i = \omega^{h_i} \cdot \tilde{v}_i$ for $-c < h_i \leq 0$.
- It is compatible with the parabolic filtration F.

We put $b_i := \deg^F(v_i)$, and then we have $-1 < b_i \leq 0$.

Lemma 7.35 *We have* $-1 < c^{-1} \cdot (h + b_i) \leq 0$.

Proof Since we have $-c+1 \leq h \leq 0$ and $-1 < b_i \leq 0$, we obtain $-c \leq h + b_i < 0$. ■

Let us take the section $\tilde{v}_i$ of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ for each v_i as above. Then we obtain the tuple of sections $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = (\tilde{v}_i)$.

Lemma 7.36 $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ *is a holomorphic frame of* ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$*, compatible with the parabolic filtration.*

Proof We put $\tilde{b}_i := c^{-1} \cdot (b_i + h - c)$. We put as follows:

$$\tilde{v}'_i := |z|^{\tilde{b}_i} \cdot \tilde{v}_i, \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = (\tilde{v}_i).$$

Then it can be checked that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is adapted up to log order. Thus we have only to apply Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5. ■

7.2.6 Functoriality for tensor product

Let $(E^{(a)}, \overline{\partial}_{E^{(a)}}, \theta^{(a)}, h^{(a)})$ $(a = 1, 2)$ be tame harmonic bundles over $X - D$. We obtain the prolonged deformed holomorphic bundles ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(a)\,\lambda}$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(a)}$ be holomorphic frames of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(a)\,\lambda}$ compatible with the parabolic filtration F. We put $b_i^{(a)} := \deg^F(v_i^{(a)})$, and $v_i^{(a)\,\prime} := |z|^{b_i^{(a)}} v_i^{(a)}$. The tuple of sections $\boldsymbol{v}^{(a)\,\prime} = (v_i^{(a)\,\prime})$ gives a C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,(a)}$ over $X - D$, which is adapted up to log order.

Then we obtain the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)\,\prime} \otimes \boldsymbol{v}^{(2)\,\prime}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}$, given as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)\,\prime} \otimes \boldsymbol{v}^{(2)\,\prime} = \Bigl(v_i^{(1)\,\prime} \otimes v_j^{(2)\,\prime} \Bigm| 1 \leq i \leq \operatorname{rank} E^{(1)},\ 1 \leq j \leq \operatorname{rank} E^{(2)} \Bigr).$$

It is adapted up to log order. Hence we put $w_{i\,j} := z^{-\epsilon(i,j)} \cdot v_i^{(1)} \otimes v_j^{(2)}$, where $\epsilon(i,j)$ are given as follows:

$$\epsilon(i,j) := \begin{cases} 1 & (b_i^{(1)} + b_j^{(2)} \leq -1) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise, i.e., } -1 < b_i^{(1)} + b_j^{(2)} \leq 0). \end{cases}$$

Then we obtain the tuple of holomorphic sections $\boldsymbol{w} = \bigl(w_{i\,j} \bigm| 1 \leq i \leq \operatorname{rank} E^{(1)},\ 1 \leq j \leq \operatorname{rank} E^{(2)} \bigr)$, and it gives the holomorphic frame of ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}\bigr)$, compatible with the filtration.

Corollary 7.11 *We have the surjective morphism* $\psi : \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda}) \times \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}\bigr)\bigr)$*. For elements* $u_i = (b_i, \beta_i)$ *for* $i = 1, 2$*, the element* $\psi(u_1, u_2)$ *is given as follows:*

$$\psi(u_1, u_2) = \bigl(\kappa(b_1 + b_2),\ \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \nu(b_1 + b_2) \cdot \lambda \bigr).$$

We have the equality of the multiplicities:

$$\mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u) = \sum_{\psi(u_1, u_2) = u} \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u_1) \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, u_2)$$

∎

Corollary 7.12 *We have the isomorphisms:*

$$\operatorname{Gr}_b^F\bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}\bigr)\bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\kappa(b_1 + b_2) = b} \operatorname{Gr}_{b_1}^F({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda}) \otimes \operatorname{Gr}_{b_2}^F({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}).$$

$$\operatorname{Gr}_u^{F,\mathbb{E}}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}\bigr)\bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\psi(u_1, u_2) = u} \operatorname{Gr}_{u_1}^{F,\mathbb{E}}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda}) \otimes \operatorname{Gr}_{u_2}^{F,\mathbb{E}}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}).$$

∎

Corollary 7.13 *We have the isomorphism:*

$$\operatorname{Gr}_b^F({}^{\diamond}\operatorname{Sym}^h \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq \bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{m}) \in \mathcal{S}(b,h)} \bigotimes_i \operatorname{Sym}^{m_i}(\operatorname{Gr}_{b_i}^F {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

Here we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(b,h) := \Bigl\{ (\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{m}) \Bigm| \sum m_i = h, \quad \kappa\Bigl(\sum m_i b_i\Bigr) = b \Bigr\}$$

In all, we have an isomorphism $\operatorname{Gr}^F({}^{\diamond}\operatorname{Sym}^{\cdot} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq \operatorname{Sym}^{\cdot}(\operatorname{Gr}^F {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$.

We also have an isomorphism:

$$\operatorname{Gr}_b^F\Bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigwedge^{h} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\Bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{m}) \in \mathcal{S}(b,h)} \bigotimes_i \bigwedge^{m_i}(\operatorname{Gr}_{b_i}^F {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

We have $\operatorname{Gr}^F({}^{\diamond}\bigwedge^{\cdot} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq \bigwedge^{\cdot}(\operatorname{Gr}^F {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. ∎

7.2.7 Functoriality for dual

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ compatible with F. We put $b_i := \deg^F(v_i)$ $v'_i := |z|^{b_i} \cdot v_i$, and $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v'_i)$. Then we obtain the dual frame $\boldsymbol{v}'^\vee$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,\vee}$ over $X - D$. It is adapted up to log order.

Let $\boldsymbol{v}^\vee = (v_i^\vee)$ be the dual frame of $\boldsymbol{v}$ over $X - D$. Then it gives a holomorphic frame of ${}_{1-\epsilon}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,\vee}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Then we put $w_i := z^{\epsilon(i)} \cdot v_i^\vee$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_i)$, where $\epsilon(i)$ is given as follows:

$$\epsilon(i) := \begin{cases} 1 & (b_i \neq 0) \\ 0 & (b_i = 0). \end{cases}$$

Then $\boldsymbol{w}$ is a holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}$ compatible with F.

Corollary 7.14 *We have the bijection* $\psi : \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,\vee})$. *For any* $u = (b, \beta)$, $\psi(u)$ *is given by* $\bigl(\kappa(-b), -\beta - \nu(-\beta)\bigr)$. *We also have the isomorphism* $\mathrm{Gr}^{F\,\mathbb{E}}_u({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{F\,\mathbb{E}}_{\psi(u)}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\,\vee})$. ▮

7.3 Basic comparison due to Simpson

7.3.1 The statement

We put $X = \Delta$ and $D = \{O\}$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. As is already seen, we obtain the vector space $V_u := \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{E},F}_u({}^\diamond E_{|O})$ and N_u. We have the model bundle $E(V, N)$ as in Lemma 6.4:

$$(E_0, \overline{\partial}_{E_0}, h_0, \theta_0) = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond E)} E(V_u, N_u) \otimes L(u).$$

We can pick an isomorphism $\Phi : {}^\diamond E_0 \longrightarrow {}^\diamond E$ satisfying the following:

- Φ preserves the parabolic filtrations.
- The induced morphism $\mathrm{Gr}^F_a(\Phi) \in \mathit{Hom}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}^\diamond E_0), \mathrm{Gr}^F_a({}^\diamond E)\bigr)$ is compatible with the morphisms $\mathrm{Gr}^F_a(\mathrm{Res}(\theta_0))$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^F_a(\mathrm{Res}(\theta))$.

Proposition 7.4 (Simpson) Φ *and* Φ^{-1} *are bounded.*

Proof See the subsubsection 4.3.3 in the previous paper [38], for example. ▮

Since we have $\mathcal{E}^\lambda = E$ and $\mathcal{E}^\lambda_0 = E_0$ as C^∞-bundles, we obtain the C^∞-isomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{E}^\lambda_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^\lambda$ on $\mathcal{X}^\lambda - \mathcal{D}^\lambda$. Let us take holomorphic frames $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda_0$ and ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, which are compatible with generalized eigen decompositions $\mathbb{E}$, parabolic filtrations F and the weight filtrations W. We put as follows:

$$\deg^F(v_j) = b_j, \qquad \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_j) = \beta_j, \qquad \frac{\deg^W(v_j)}{2} = k_j,$$

$$\deg^F(v_{0\,i}) = b_{0\,i} \quad \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_{0\,i}) = \beta_{0\,i}, \quad \frac{\deg^W(v_{0\,i})}{2} = k_{0\,i}.$$

We also put as follows:

$$v'_j := v_j \cdot |z|^{b_j} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k_j}, \qquad \boldsymbol{v}' = (v'_j),$$

$$v'_{0\,i} := v_{0\,i} \cdot |z|^{b_{0\,i}} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k_{0\,i}}, \quad \boldsymbol{v}'_0 = (v'_{0\,i}).$$

Then we obtain the C^∞-functions I and I' of $X - D$ to $M(r)$ defined as follows:

$$\Phi(v_{0\,i}) = \sum I_{j,i} \cdot v_j, \quad \Phi(v'_{0\,i}) = \sum I'_{j,i} \cdot v'_j.$$

The following lemma can be checked by a direct calculation.

Lemma 7.37 *We have the equality* $I'_{j,i} = I_{j,i} \cdot |z|^{b_{0,i}-b_j} \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)^{-k_{0,i}+k_j}$. ▮

By the isomorphism Φ, we identify E and E_0. Let $\theta^{\dagger}$ be the conjugate of θ with respect to h, and $\theta_0^{\dagger}$ be the conjugate of θ_0 with respect to h_0. Recall the following lemma.

Lemma 7.38 (Simpson, Lemma 7.3, Lemma 7.7 [50]) *We have the following inequalities:*

$$|\theta^{\dagger} - \theta_0^{\dagger}|_h \leq C \cdot |z|^{-1}(-\log|z|)^{-1}, \qquad \int |\theta^{\dagger} - \theta_0^{\dagger}|_h \cdot |z| \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big) \frac{|dz \cdot d\bar{z}|}{|z|^2 \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)} < \infty.$$

Here C denotes some positive constant. ▮

We also recall an outline of the proof of the following lemma.

Proposition 7.5 (Simpson)

1. *I' and I'^{-1} are bounded.*
2. *We have the inequality $|I'_{j\,i}| \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$ in the case $(b_j, \beta_j) \neq (b_{0\,i}, \beta_{0\,i})$.*
3. *We have the inequality $||I'_{j\,i}||_W < \infty$ in the case $k_j \neq k_{0\,i}$. (See the page 764 of [50] or the subsubsection 4.3.4 of [38] for the norm $||\cdot||_W$.)*

In the case $\lambda = 1$, the proposition is given by Simpson (the section 7 in [50]). His argument clearly works in general case. Hence we only indicate an outline. See loc.cit. for more detail.

7.3.2 Outline of the proof of Proposition 7.5

The claim 1 immediately follows from the boundedness of Φ and Φ^{-1}, and the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ and $\boldsymbol{v}'_0$. Note that $\overline{\partial}\Phi = \lambda \cdot (\theta_0^{\dagger} - \theta^{\dagger})$. We can apply the argument of Simpson, and we obtain the claim 3.

Let us see the outline of the proof of the claim 2. The holomorphic sections $\psi, \psi^{(1)}$ of $End(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}$ are given as follows:

$$\psi(v_j) := v_j \cdot (\beta_j + \lambda \cdot b_j) \cdot \frac{dz}{z}, \qquad \psi^{(1)}(v_j) := v_j \cdot (-\lambda \cdot b_j)\frac{dz}{z}. \tag{131}$$

For any holomorphic section f of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ such that $|f|_h \leq C_1 \cdot |z|^{-b} \cdot (-\log|z|)^k$, it is easy to see that there exists a positive constant C_2 such that the following holds:

$$\big|\mathbb{D}^{\lambda} f - \psi(f) - \psi_1^{(1)}(f)\big|_h \leq C_2 \cdot |z|^{-b-1}(-\log|z|)^{k-1}.$$

Lemma 7.39 (Lemma 7.2 of [50]) *We have the following finiteness:*

$$\int \big|\psi - (1+|\lambda|^2)\theta\big|_h^2 \cdot (-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon} \cdot |dzd\bar{z}| < \infty.$$

Proof We have only to show the following claim: If $|f| \leq C_3 \cdot |z|^{-b} \cdot (-\log|z|)^k$, then we have the finiteness:

$$\int \big|\psi(f) - (1+|\lambda|^2)\theta(f)\big|_h \cdot |z|^{2b} \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)^{1-\epsilon-2k} \cdot |dzd\bar{z}| < \infty. \tag{132}$$

We have only to show the inequality (132) in the case $b = 0$. Note the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\psi(f) - (1+|\lambda|^2) \cdot \theta(f)\big|^2 &\leq 2 \cdot \big|\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}(f) - (1+|\lambda|^2) \cdot \theta(f)\big|^2 + C \cdot |z|^{-2}\big(-\log|z|\big)^{2(k-1)} \\ &= 2 \cdot |\lambda|^2 \cdot |\partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}(f)|^2 + C \cdot |z|^{-2} \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)^{2(k-1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

We have the Weitzenbeck formula:

$$\Delta|f|_h^2 = -|\partial_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} f|^2 + (1+|\lambda|^2)\cdot\big(|\theta f|_h^2 - |\theta^\dagger f|_h^2\big). \tag{134}$$

Hence we obtain the following, for some positive constant C:

$$\Delta\big(|f|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon-2k}\big) \leq -\frac{1}{2}\big|\partial_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} f\big|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon-2k} + C\cdot|f|_h^2\cdot|z|^{-2}\cdot\big(-\log|z|\big)^{-1-\epsilon-2k}. \tag{135}$$

By using (135) and the equivalence of the norms $|f|\sim(-\log|z|)^k$, we obtain the following:

$$\Delta\Big(\big(|f|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-2k} - C\big)\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon}\Big) \leq -\frac{1}{2}|\partial_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} f|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon-2k}.$$

We put as follows:

$$F := \Big(|f|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-2k} - C\Big)\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon}.$$

Then we obtain the following:

$$\lim_{|z|\to 0}\frac{F}{-\log|z|} = 0.$$

Hence we obtain the inequality:

$$\int|\partial_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda} f|_h^2\cdot(-\log|z|)^{1-\epsilon-2k}\cdot|dzd\bar{z}| < \infty. \tag{136}$$

From (133) and (136), we obtain Lemma 7.39. ∎

Since Simpson's proof of Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 in [50] (for the case $\lambda = 1$) can be also easily applied to the general case $\lambda\neq 1$, we omit to give a proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 7.40 (Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 in [50]) *We have the following inequalities:*

$$|(1+|\lambda|^2)\theta - \psi|_h \leq |z|^{-1}(-\log|z|)^{-1}. \tag{137}$$

$$|\psi - \psi_0|_h \leq |z|^{-1}(-\log|z|)^{-1}. \tag{138}$$

∎

Corollary 7.15 (Lemma 7.11 in [50]) *In the case $\beta_j + \lambda\cdot b_j \neq \beta_{0\,i} + \lambda\cdot b_i$, we have the inequality $|I'_{i,j}| \leq (-\log|z|)^{-1}$.*

Proof It is not difficult to derive the claim from (138). See the proof of Lemma 7.11 of [50]. ∎

Note the relation $\overline{\partial}\Phi = \lambda\cdot(\theta_0^\dagger - \theta^\dagger)$. Then we obtain the following:

$$|\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}|\cdot|z|^{b_{0\,i}-b_j}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-k_{0,i}+k_j} \leq C\cdot|z|^{-1}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}.$$

In the case $b_{0,i} - b_j \neq 0$, we can pick the C^∞-function $h(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j})$ on Δ^* satisfying the following:

- $\overline{\partial}h\big(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}\big) = \overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}$.
- $|h(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j})|\cdot|z|^{b_{0,i}-b_j}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-k_{0,i}+k_j} \leq C\cdot\big(-\log|z|\big)^{-1}$.

Then we obtain the following:

- $h\big(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}\big) - I_{i\,j}$ is holomorphic on $X - D$.
- $\big|h\big(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}\big) - I_{i\,j}\big|\cdot|z|^{b_{0\,i}-b_j}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-k_{0\,i}+k_j}$ bounded.

Hence we obtain the following inequality in the case $b_{0\,i} - b_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\big|h\big(\overline{\partial}I_{i\,j}\big) - I_{i\,j}\big|\cdot|z|^{b_{0\,i}-b_j}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-k_{0\,i}+k_j} \leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}. \tag{139}$$

Hence we have the inequality $|I_{i\,j}| \leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}$ in the case $b_{0\,i}\neq b_j$. Thus we obtain the claim 2 from Corollary 7.15 and (139), and the outline of the proof of Proposition 7.5 is finished. ∎

7.3.3 Some consequences

Recall the bijection $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \boldsymbol{C} \times \boldsymbol{R} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C} \times \boldsymbol{R}$ is defined in the subsubsection 2.1.6.

Corollary 7.16 *Let u be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$. Then $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda, u) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, and we have the equality:*

$$\dim \mathrm{Gr}_k^W(\mathrm{Gr}_u^{\mathbb{E},F}(\mathcal{E}^0)) = \dim \mathrm{Gr}_k^W(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u)}^{\mathbb{E},F}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)).$$

In particular, we obtain the bijective morphism $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ and the following equality:

$$\dim\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_u^{\mathbb{E},F}(\mathcal{E}^0)\bigr) = \dim\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u)}^{\mathbb{E},F}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)\bigr), \quad \mathfrak{m}(0,u) = \mathfrak{m}\bigl(\lambda, \mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u)\bigr).$$

Proof The claims for the model bundles can be checked by direct calculations. Then the claims for general tame harmonic bundles follows from Proposition 7.5. ∎

Corollary 7.17 *Let $\boldsymbol{e}$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond E$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W. We put as follows:*

$$b(e_j) := \deg^F(e_j), \quad k(e_j) := \frac{\deg^W(e_j)}{2}, \quad b(v_i) := \deg^F(v_i), \quad k(v_i) := \frac{\deg^W(v_i)}{2}.$$

We put as follows:

$$e'_j := e_j \cdot |z|^{b(e_j)} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k(e_j)}, \quad v'_i := v_i \cdot |z|^{b(v_i)} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k(v_i)}.$$

The C^∞-function $B : X - D \longrightarrow M(r)$ is given as follows:

$$v'_i = \sum B'_{j\,i} \cdot e'_j.$$

Then we have the following:

- *B' and ${B'}^{-1}$ are bounded.*
- *$|B'_{j\,i}| \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$ in the case* $\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(v_i) \neq \mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(e_j))$.

Proof For the case of model bundles, we pick $\boldsymbol{e}_0$, $\boldsymbol{e}'_0$, $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{v}'_0$ similarly, and then we obtain $B'_{0,j\,i}$. In this case, we may assume the following, due to the construction of model bundles:

(A): $B'_{0,j\,i} = 0$ if $\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(v_{0\,i}) \neq \mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(e_{0\,j}))$.

From our construction of Φ, we may assume $\Phi(\boldsymbol{e}_0) = \boldsymbol{e}$. Then we obtain our claims due to the assumption (A) above and the claim 2 in Proposition 7.5. ∎

7.4 Multi-valued flat sections

7.4.1 Order of multi-valued flat sections

Let us fix $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$. We have the λ-connection $(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathbb{D}^\lambda)$. We have the associated flat connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$. Then we obtain the space of multi-valued flat sections, which we denote by $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

Lemma 7.41 *For any $s \in H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ and positive number C_0, there exist positive constants C_1 and b satisfying the following:*

$$|s| \leq C_1 \cdot |z|^{-b} \quad \textit{on } \bigl\{z \bigm| |\arg z| < C_0\bigr\}.$$

Proof It follows from tameness of our harmonic bundles. (See Remark in the page 732 of [50], for example. Or it is not difficult to show directly.) ▮

We have the universal covering map $\pi : \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \Delta^*$, given by $\zeta = x + \sqrt{-1}y \longmapsto \exp(\sqrt{-1}\zeta) = z$. We may regard $s \in H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ as a flat section of $\pi^*\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. We have the following equality:

$$\frac{\partial h(s,s)}{\partial x} = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\Big(h\big(\nabla^{\lambda,u}_{\partial_x} s, s\big)\Big) = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\Big(h\big((\nabla^{\lambda,u}_{\partial_x} - \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}_{\partial_x})s,\; s\big)\Big).$$

Here $\nabla^{\lambda,u}$ denote the unitary connection for $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, h)$, and ∂_x denote the vector field $\partial/\partial x$. The difference $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f} - \nabla^{\lambda,u}$ is given by $a \cdot \theta + b \cdot \theta^{\dagger}$ $(a, b \in \boldsymbol{C})$. We have the description $\theta = \theta^{\zeta} \cdot d\zeta$ and $\theta^{\dagger} = \theta^{\zeta\,\dagger} d\bar{\zeta}$. Due to Simpson's main estimate (Proposition 7.1 [I]), we have the boundedness $|\theta^{\zeta}|_h \leq C$ and $|\theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}|_h \leq C$. Hence we obtain the following inequality for some positive constant C:

$$\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\log|s|_h^2\right| = \left|\frac{\partial h(s,s)}{\partial x}\cdot h(s,s)^{-1}\right| \leq 2|a|\cdot\big|\theta^{\zeta}\big|_h + 2|b|\cdot\big|\theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}\big|_h \leq C. \tag{140}$$

Lemma 7.42 *For any positive number C_1, there exists a positive constants C_2 such that the following holds:*

- *For any $x_i \in \boldsymbol{R}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that $|x_i| < C_1$, and for any $y > 1$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\Big|\log\big|s(x_1, y)\big|_h^2 - \log\big|s(x_2, y)\big|_h^2\Big| \leq C_2$$

Proof It immediately follows from the inequality (140). ▮

Definition 7.5 *Let s be an element of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, b be any real number. Then '$-\mathrm{ord}(s) \leq b$' means the following:*

- *Pick any real number $x_1 \in \boldsymbol{R}$. For any positive number $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive constant C such that $|s(x_1, y)| \leq C \cdot e^{(b+\epsilon)\cdot y}$.*

Note that such property does not depend on a choice of x_1, due to Lemma 7.42. ▮

Definition 7.6 *We put as follows:*

$$\mathcal{F}_b(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})) := \big\{s \in H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\,\big|\, -\mathrm{ord}(s) \leq b\big\}.$$

Thus we obtain the filtration $\mathcal{F}$ on $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. ▮

Let M^{λ} be the monodromy on $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$.

Lemma 7.43 *The filtration $\mathcal{F}$ is preserved by M^{λ}. In particular, $\mathcal{F}$ is compatible with the generalized eigen decomposition of M^{λ}.*

Proof It is clear from our definition of the filtration $\mathcal{F}$. ▮

7.4.2 Compatibility with the order for holomorphic sections

Let us consider the $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ with respect to the monodromy M^{λ}:

$$H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \bigoplus_{\omega \in Sp(M^{\lambda})} \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega\big).$$

Let M^{λ}_{ω} denote the restriction of M^{λ} to $\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega\big)$.

Pick a real number $b \in \boldsymbol{R}$. Then there exists the unique complex number $\alpha = \alpha(b, \omega)$ satisfying the following:

- $\exp\big(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\cdot\alpha\big) = \omega$.

- $b \leq \mathrm{Re}(\alpha) < b+1$.

Note that the number $b - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(b,\omega)\big)$ is independent of b.

Let $M_{\omega}^{\lambda,u}$ denote the unipotent part of M_{ω}^{λ}, and we put as follows:

$$N_{\omega}^{\lambda} := \frac{-1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \log M_{\omega}^{\lambda,u} = \frac{-1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n} (M_{\omega}^{\lambda,u} - 1)^n.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\exp\Big(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\big(\alpha(b,\omega) + N_{\omega}^{\lambda}\big)\Big) = M_{\omega}^{\lambda}.$$

Let s be an element of $\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big)$. We put as follows:

$$F(s,b) := \exp\Big(\sqrt{-1}\zeta \cdot \big(\alpha(b,\omega) + N_{\omega}^{\lambda}\big)\Big) \cdot s = \exp\Big(\log z \cdot \big(\alpha(b,\omega) + N_{\omega}^{\lambda}\big)\Big) \cdot s.$$

Then $F(s,b)$ induces the holomorphic section of $X - D$.

Lemma 7.44 *Let s be an element of $\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big)$. We have the following equality:*

$$-\mathrm{ord}\big(F(s,b)\big) = -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(b,\omega)\big). \tag{141}$$

Proof We take $s_1, \ldots, s_l$ as $s_h = (N_{\omega}^{\lambda})^h \cdot s$. We have the following equality:

$$F(s,b) = z^{\alpha(b,\omega)} \cdot \Big(s + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{1}{i!} s_i\Big). \tag{142}$$

Hence we obtain $-\mathrm{ord}(F(s,b)) \leq -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(b,\omega))$.

Let us consider the case that $s \in \mathcal{F}_b$ and $N_{\omega} s \in \mathcal{F}_{<b_1}$. Then s_i $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ above are contained in $\mathcal{F}_{<b_1}$, and thus we have $-\mathrm{ord}(F(s,b)) = -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(b,\omega)\big)$.

Assume $s \in \mathcal{F}_{b_1}$. The number $i(s)$ is determined for s by the following condition:

$$s_{i(s)} \notin \mathcal{F}_{<b_1}, \quad s_{i(s)+1} \in \mathcal{F}_{<b_1}.$$

To show the equality (141), we use an induction on $i(s)$. If $i(s) = 0$, then we have already shown the claim. We assume that the claim holds for any s such that $i(s) < i_0$, and we will show the claim for s such that $i(s) = i_0$. Note that $i(N_{\omega} s) = i_0 - 1$, and we have the equality $-\mathrm{ord}(F(N_{\omega} s)) = -\mathrm{ord}(N_{\omega} s) - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(b,\omega)) = b_3$ due to the hypothesis of the induction. Note the following equality:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}(F(s,b)) = \alpha(b,\omega) \cdot F(s,b) \cdot \frac{dz}{z} + F(N_{\omega} \cdot s, b) \cdot \frac{dz}{z}.$$

Assume $b_2 := -\mathrm{ord}(F(s,b)) < -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(b,\omega)) =: b_3$, and we will derive the contradiction. Note that $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f} F(s,b)$ and $\alpha(b,\omega) \cdot F(s,b) \frac{dz}{z}$ are sections of ${}_{b_2+1}\mathcal{E} \otimes \Omega_X^{1,0}$. On the other hand, $F(N_{\omega} \cdot s, b) \frac{dz}{z}$ is a section of ${}_{b_3+1}\mathcal{E} \otimes \Omega_X^{1,0}$ such that it is not 0 in $\mathrm{Gr}_{b_3+1}^{F}$. Hence we have arrived at the contradiction. It implies $-\mathrm{ord}(F(s,b)) = -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(b,\omega))$, and thus the induction on $i(s)$ can proceed. Hence we are done. ∎

7.4.3 The compatibility of the KMS-structures

Let us pick real numbers c and a, and a complex number $\omega \in \boldsymbol{C}$. Recall we have the following inequality, by definition:

$$c - a - 1 < -\mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(a-c,\omega)\big) \leq c - a.$$

In the case $-\mathrm{ord}(s) \leq a$, we obtain the following:

$$-\mathrm{ord}\big(F(s, a-c)\big) = -\mathrm{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(a-c,\omega)\big) \leq a - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(a-c,\omega)\big) \leq c.$$

Hence $F(s, a-c)$ gives a section of ${}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

We put $d(a,\omega) := a - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha(a,\omega)\big) < 0$. Then the morphism $\mathcal{F}_a\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big) \longrightarrow {}_{d(a,\omega)}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is given by the correspondence $s \longmapsto F(s,a)$, and we obtain the following induced morphism:

$$\varphi_{(a,\omega)} : \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a\,\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{d(a,\omega)}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}).$$

Lemma 7.45 *The morphism* $\varphi_{(a,\omega)}$ *is injective.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 7.44. ∎

We have the action of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a(N^{\lambda}_{\omega})$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a\,\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega)$ for each a. Then we obtain the following endomorphism:

$$\alpha(a,\omega) + \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a(N^{\lambda}_{\omega}) \in \mathrm{End}\Big(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a\,\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big)\Big).$$

On the other hand, the endomorphism $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})$ on ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$ induces the following endomorphism:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{d(a,\omega)}\big(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})\big) \in \mathrm{End}\Big(\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{d(a,\omega)}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})\Big).$$

Lemma 7.46 *We have the following equality:*

$$\varphi_{(a,\omega)} \circ \Big(\alpha(a,\omega) + \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a(N^{\lambda}_{\omega})\Big) = \mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{d(a,\omega)}(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})) \circ \varphi_{(a,\omega)}.$$

Proof We have the following morphism due to $F(\cdot,a)$:

$$\Big(\mathcal{F}_a\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega),\ \alpha(a,\omega) + \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a(N^{\lambda}_{\omega})\Big) \longrightarrow \Big(\Gamma(X, {}_{d}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\ \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\Big)$$

Here we put $d := d(a,\omega)$.

We also have the following morphisms:

$$\Gamma(X, {}_{d}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow F_d({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{F}_d({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}).$$

These morphisms are equivariant with respect to the operators $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$, $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_d(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}))$ respectively. Thus we are done. ∎

Corollary 7.18 *We have the following implication in* $\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_d({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$*:*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\varphi_{(a,\omega)}) \subset \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_d\big(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})\big),\ \alpha(a,\omega)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_d\big(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})\big),\ \lambda\cdot\alpha(a,\omega)\big).$$

Here we put $d := d(a,\omega) = a - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(a,\omega)) < 0$.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 7.46. ∎

For any $u_1 = (a,\omega) \in \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}$, we put as follows:

$$\mathfrak{t}(u_1) = \big(d(a,\omega),\ \lambda\cdot\alpha(a,\omega)\big).$$

Thus we obtain the map $\mathfrak{t} : \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*} \longrightarrow]-1,0]\times\boldsymbol{C}$.

Lemma 7.47 $\mathfrak{t}$ *is bijective.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

For any $u_1 = (a,\omega) \in \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^{*}$, we put as follows:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u_1}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\big) := \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_a\,\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big).$$

Then we obtain the injection:

$$\varphi_{u_1} : \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u_1}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_{\mathfrak{t}(u_1)}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$$

Then we obtain the following injection:

$$\bigoplus_{u_1\in \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*} \varphi_{u_1} : \bigoplus_{u_1\in \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*} \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u_1}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})} \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_{u}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

Proposition 7.6 *The morphism* $\bigoplus_{u_1\in \boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*} \varphi_{u_1}$ *is isomorphic. Each* φ_{u_1} *is isomorphic.*

Proof We have already known that φ_{u_1} are injective (Lemma 7.45). We have the following equalities:

$$\sum_{u_1} \dim \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u_1} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \sum_{u\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})} \dim \mathrm{Gr}^{F,\mathbb{E}}_{u}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

The claims follow from the equalities above. ∎

We have the weight filtration W on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ induced by the nilpotent map $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{a}(N_{\omega})$, where we have $u=(a,\omega)$.

Lemma 7.48 *The morphism* φ_u *preserves the weight filtrations* W*.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 7.46. ∎

7.4.4 Norm estimate for the multi-valued flat sections

Let $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_i)$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ satisfying the following conditions:

Condition 7.2

1. *It is compatible with* $\mathbb{E}$*. We put* $\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(s_i)=\omega_i$*.*
2. *It is compatible with* $\mathcal{F}$ *on* $\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\bigr)$ *for any* ω*. We put* $\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i)=a_i$*.*
3. *From the conditions* 1 *and* 2 *above, we obtain the induced frame* $\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)}$ *on* $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$*. The frame* $\boldsymbol{s}^{(1)}$ *is compatible with the weight filtration* W*. We put* $\deg^{W}(s^{(1)}_i)=k_i$*.*

If the conditions above are satisfied, we say that $\boldsymbol{s}$ *is compatible with* $\mathcal{F}$*,* $\mathbb{E}$ *and* W*.* ∎

The matrix $(b^{(n)}_{j\,i})$ is determined by the following condition:

$$(N^{\lambda})^n s_i = \sum_j b^{(n)}_{j\,i}\cdot s_j.$$

Lemma 7.49 *We have* $b_{j\,i}=0$ *in the following cases:*

- $\omega_0\neq\omega_j$*.*
- $\omega_i=\omega_j$ *and* $a_i<a_j$*.*
- $(\omega_i,a_i)=(\omega_j,a_j)$ *and* $k_i-n<k_j$*.*

Proof It is clear from our choice of $\boldsymbol{s}$. ∎

We put $v_i := F(s_i,a_i)$, and $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a tuple of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. We put $\alpha_i=\alpha(a_i,\omega_i)$.

Lemma 7.50 *The tuple of sections* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *is a frame of* ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ *which is compatible with* $\mathbb{E}$*,* F *and* W*.*

Proof It immediately follows from Proposition 7.6 and Lemma 7.46. ∎

Lemma 7.51 *We have the following equality:*

$$(N^{\lambda})^n v_i = \sum_{\substack{\omega_i=\omega_j,\\ a_i\geq a_j}} b^{(n)}_{j\,i}\cdot z^{\alpha_i-\alpha_j}\cdot v_j .$$

Note that if $\omega_i=\omega_j$ *and* $a_i\geq a_j$*, then* $\alpha_i-\alpha_j$ *is a non-negative integer.*

Proof We have the following equalities:

$$(N^{\lambda})^n v_i = F\big((N^{\lambda})^n s_i, -a_i\big) = \sum_{\substack{\omega_i=\omega_j,\\ a_i\geq a_j}} b^{(n)}_{j\,i}\cdot F(s_j,-a_i) = \sum_{\substack{\omega_i=\omega_j,\\ a_i\geq a_j}} b^{(n)}_{j\,i}\cdot z^{\alpha_i-\alpha_j}\cdot F(s_j,-a_j).$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Let C be any positive number. We put $\alpha_i := \alpha(a_i,\omega_i)$. On the region $\big\{z\,\big|\,|\arg z|<C\big\}$, we have the following equalities:

$$s_i = z^{-\alpha_i}\cdot \exp(-\log z\cdot N^{\lambda}_{\omega})\cdot v_i = z^{-\alpha_i}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!}(-\log z)^n\cdot (N^{\lambda})^n\cdot v_i. \tag{143}$$

It can be described as $s_i = z^{-\alpha_i}\sum f_j\cdot v_j$ for some multi-valued holomorphic functions f_j.

Lemma 7.52 *Let* C *be a positive number. We have the following, on the region* $\big\{|\arg z|<C\big\}$*:*

- $f_i = 1$.
- $|f_j|\leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{(k_i-k_j)/2}$ *for some positive constant* C*, in the case* $(a_i,\omega_i)=(a_j,\omega_j)$ *and* $k_i>k_j$*.*
- $|f_j|\leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{M}$ *for some positive constants* C *and* M*, in the case* $\omega_i=\omega_j$ *and* $a_i>a_j$*.*
- *Otherwise,* f_j *vanishes identically.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 7.51 and (143). ∎

We put $s'_i := s_i\cdot |z|^{a_i}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-k_i/2}$, and $\boldsymbol{s}' := (s'_i)$.

Proposition 7.7 $\boldsymbol{s}'$ *is adapted on the region* $\big\{s\,\big|\,|\arg z|<C\big\}$ *for any positive constant* C*.*

Proof It is a direct corollary of Lemma 7.52 and the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$. ∎

7.4.5 The decomposition and the filtration of the flat bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$

We have the generalized eigen decomposition over $X-D$ for the monodromy M^{λ}:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\omega\in\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega). \tag{144}$$

Corollary 7.19 *The decomposition is quasi adapted (Definition* 2.2*).*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be the frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ obtained from $\boldsymbol{s}$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}$ is compatible with the generalized eigen decomposition above, and $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted. Thus the decomposition is quasi adapted. ∎

Let c be any real number. Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, $\mathcal{F}$ and W. We put ${}_cv_i := F(s_i, a_i-c)$, and ${}_c\boldsymbol{v} = ({}_cv_i)$. We put ${}_c\alpha_i := \alpha(a_i-c_i,\omega_i)$.

Lemma 7.53 *The tuple of sections* ${}_c\boldsymbol{v}$ *is a frame of* ${}_c\mathcal{E}$ *compatible with* F*,* $\mathbb{E}$ *and* W*. We have the following:*

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}({}_cv_i) = \Big({}_c\alpha_i\cdot{}_cv_i + \sum_{\substack{\omega_i=\omega_j,\\ a_i\geq a_j}} b^{(1)}_{j\,i}\cdot z^{{}_c\alpha_i-{}_c\alpha_j}\cdot{}_cv_j\Big)\cdot\frac{dz}{z}. \tag{145}$$

Proof Since $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ compatible with the parabolic filtration, it is easy to check ${}_{c}\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}_{c}\mathcal{E}$, compatible with the parabolic filtration. The equality (145) follows from the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}({}_{c}v_i) = \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\bigl(z^{{}_{c}\alpha_i}\cdot \exp\bigl(\log z\cdot N^{\lambda}_{\omega_i}\bigr)\cdot s_i\bigr) = \bigl({}_{c}\alpha_i + N^{\lambda}_{\omega_i}\bigr)\cdot {}_{c}v_i\cdot \frac{dz}{z}\\ = \Bigl({}_{c}\alpha_i\cdot {}_{c}v_i + \sum_{\substack{\omega_i=\omega_j,\\ a_i\geq a_j}} b^{(1)}_{j\,i}\cdot z^{{}_{c}\alpha_i - {}_{c}\alpha_j}\cdot {}_{c}v_j\Bigr)\frac{dz}{z}. \qquad (146)\end{aligned}$$

The compatibility of ${}_{c}\boldsymbol{v}$ with $\mathbb{E}$ and W follows from the formula (145). ∎

Corollary 7.20 *The decomposition* (144) *is prolonged to the following:*

$$ {}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\omega\in\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})} {}_{c}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega).$$

In particular, ${}_{c}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)$ *is locally free.*

Proof It is easy to check the claim by using the frame ${}_{c}\boldsymbol{v}$. ∎

We obtain two decomposition of ${}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$:

$$ {}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} = \bigoplus_{\beta}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\operatorname{Res}\mathbb{D}^{\lambda},\beta\bigr) = \bigoplus_{\omega\in\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})} {}_{c}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)_{|O}.$$

Corollary 7.21 *The following holds:*

$$ {}_{c}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)_{|O} = \bigoplus_{\exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta)=\omega}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\operatorname{Res}\mathbb{D}^{\lambda},\beta\bigr).$$

Proof It immediately follows from the formula (145). ∎

The filtration $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega)$ induces the filtration $\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr)$ on $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)$.

Lemma 7.54 *The filtration* $\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr)$ *can be prolonged to the filtration* ${}_{c}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega))\bigr)$. *We have the following equality:*

$$ {}_{c}\mathcal{F}_a\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr) = \bigl\langle {}_{c}v_i \bigm| \omega_i=\omega,\, a_i\leq a\bigr\rangle.$$

We also have ${}_{c}\mathcal{F}_a(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = \bigoplus_{\omega}{}_{c}\mathcal{F}_a\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr)$.

Proof It is clear from our definition. ∎

Then we obtain the two filtrations on ${}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}$, one is $F({}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$ and the other is ${}_{c}\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{|O}$.

Lemma 7.55 *We have the following relation:*

$$ {}_{c}\mathcal{F}_a\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr)_{|O} = F_{d(a,\omega)}\bigl(\mathbb{E}({}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O},\lambda\cdot\alpha(a-c,\omega))\bigr)\oplus\bigoplus_{\substack{\exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\beta)=\omega,\\ \operatorname{Re}(\lambda^{-1}\beta)<\operatorname{Re}(\alpha(a-c,\omega))}}\mathbb{E}({}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O},\beta).$$

Proof It can be shown by using the frame ${}_{c}\boldsymbol{v}$. ∎

The nilpotent morphism N^{λ}_{ω} on $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega)$ induces the endomorphism N^{λ}_{ω} on $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)$ over $X-D$. It is prolonged to the endomorphism of ${}_{c}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)$ over X. It preserves the filtration $\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)\bigr)$. Then we obtain the nilpotent morphism $\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u}(N^{\lambda})$ on $\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ over X.

Lemma 7.56 *The conjugacy class of* $\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u}(N^{\lambda})_{|P}$ *is independent of* $P\in X$. *Hence we obtain the weight filtration* W *of* $\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}_{u}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ *in the category of the vector bundles.* ∎

7.4.6 Functoriality for tensor products

Let $(E_i, \overline{\partial}_{E_i}, h_i, \theta_i)$ $(i=1,2)$ be harmonic bundles over $X-D$. We denote the deformed holomorphic bundle by $\mathcal{E}_i^{\lambda}$ $(i=1,2)$. We have the natural following isomorphism:

$$H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}\otimes\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda})\simeq H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda})\otimes H(\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda}).$$

Lemma 7.57 *We have the natural isomorphisms:*

$$\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}\otimes\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda}),\omega\bigr)=\bigoplus_{\omega_1\times\omega_2=\omega}\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}),\omega_1\bigr)\otimes\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda}),\omega_2\bigr).$$

▮

We obtain the corresponding decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\omega)=\bigoplus_{\omega_1\times\omega_2=\omega}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda},\omega_1)\otimes\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda},\omega_2). \tag{147}$$

Lemma 7.58

1. *The decomposition* (147) *is quasi adapted (Definition* 2.2*).*
2. *We have the following:*

$$\mathcal{F}_a\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}\otimes\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda}),\omega)=\bigoplus_{\omega_1\times\omega_2=\omega}\sum_{a_1+a_2\leq a}\mathcal{F}_{a_1}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}),\omega_1)\otimes\mathcal{F}_{a_2}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda}),\omega_2).$$

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{s}_i$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}_i^{\lambda})$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, $\mathcal{F}$ and W. Then we obtain the adapted frame $\boldsymbol{s}_i'$. By using $\boldsymbol{s}_1'$ and $\boldsymbol{s}_2'$, we obtain the first claim. The second claim follows from the first claim. ▮

We have the following product of the abelian group $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}^*$: For $u_i=(a_i,\alpha_i)$, we put $u_1\cdot u_2=(a_1+a_2,\alpha_1\times\alpha_2)$.

Corollary 7.22 *We have the isomorphism:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}_u^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr)\simeq\bigoplus_{u_1\cdot u_2=u}\mathrm{Gr}_{u_1}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda})\bigr)\otimes\mathrm{Gr}_{u_2}^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}_2^{\lambda})\bigr).$$

▮

We have the natural isomorphisms:

$$\mathbb{E}\bigl(\bigwedge^{a}H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\bigr)\simeq\bigoplus_{f\in\mathcal{S}(a,\omega)}\bigotimes_{\omega'\in\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})}\bigwedge^{f(\omega')}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega'), \tag{148}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Sym}^{a}H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\bigr)\simeq\bigoplus_{f\in\mathcal{S}(a,\omega)}\bigotimes_{\omega'\in\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})}\mathrm{Sym}^{f(\omega')}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega'), \tag{149}$$

$$\mathcal{S}(a,\omega):=\Bigl\{f:\mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda})\longrightarrow\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Bigm|\prod\omega'^{f(\omega')}=\omega,\ \sum f(\omega')=a\Bigr\}. \tag{150}$$

Corollary 7.23

- *The decompositions* (148)*,* (149) *and* (150) *are quasi adapted.*
- *The parabolic filtrations on the left hand sides of* (148)*,* (149) *and* (150) *are isomorphic to the induced filtrations on the right hand side.*
- *The weight filtrations are also isomorphic.* ▮

7.4.7 Functoriality for dual

We have the natural isomorphism: $H(\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}) \simeq H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee}$.

Lemma 7.59 *Under the isomorphism, $\mathcal{F}_a H(\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda})$ is same as the following:*

$$\Big\{ f \in H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee} \,\Big|\, f(\mathcal{F}_b H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})) \subset \mathcal{F}_{b+a} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \Big\}.$$

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_i)$ be a base of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, $\mathcal{F}$, W. Let $\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee} = (s_i^{\vee})$ denote the dual base.

We put $\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i) = a_i$. We put $s_i' := s_i \cdot |z|^{a_i}$, and $\boldsymbol{s}' := (s_i')$. Then $\boldsymbol{s}'$ is adapted up to log order. We put $s_i^{\vee\,\prime} := s_i^{\vee} \cdot |z|^{-a_i}$, and $\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime} = (s_i^{\vee\,\prime})$. Then $\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime}$ is the dual base of $\boldsymbol{s}'$, and $\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime}$ is adapted up to log order. Then the claim follows easily. ▮

7.4.8 Functoriality for pull back

Let $\psi_c : X \longrightarrow X$ given by $z \longmapsto z^c$. We have the natural isomorphism:

$$\psi_c^{-1} : H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq H(\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

Let M_1^{λ} denote the monodromy of $\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. We obtain the following isomorphism for any $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda_1})$:

$$\mathbb{E}\big(H(\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega_1\big) \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{\omega \in \mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda}) \\ \omega^c = \omega_1}} \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega).$$

Lemma 7.60 *We have the following, for any element $\omega_1 \in \mathcal{S}p(M_1^{\lambda})$:*

$$\mathcal{F}_{c\cdot a}\big(\mathbb{E}\big(H(\psi_c^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega_1\big)\big) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\omega \in \mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda}) \\ \omega^c = \omega_1}} \mathcal{F}_a\big(\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \omega\big)\big). \tag{151}$$

The weight filtrations are compatible.

Proof The compatibility for the weight filtration is clear. Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, $\mathcal{F}$ and W. We put $a_i := \deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i)$, and $s_i' := s_i \cdot |z|^{a_i}$. Then $\boldsymbol{s}' = (s_i')$ is adapted up to log order.

Let consider $\psi_c^{-1}(s_i') = \psi_c^{-1}(s_i) \cdot |z|^{c\cdot a_i}$. The frame $\psi_c^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}') = \big(\psi_c^{-1}(s_i')\big)$ is adapted up to log order. Then the equality (151) follows. ▮

7.4.9 The correspondence of KMS-spectrum

We put as follows:

$$\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}^{f}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) := \Big\{ u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}^* \,\Big|\, \dim \mathrm{Gr}_u^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \neq 0 \Big\}.$$

The number $\mathfrak{m}^f(\lambda, u) := \dim \mathrm{Gr}_u^{\mathcal{F},\mathbb{E}} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ is called the multiplicity.

The maps $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda) : \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$, $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda) : \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^*$ and $\mathfrak{k}^f : \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}^*$ are defined in the subsubsection 2.1.6.

On the other hand, we put as follows, for any real number c:

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, c) := \big\{ u \in \mathcal{KMS}\big(\mathcal{E}^0\big) \,\big|\, c - 1 \leq \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) < c \big\}. \tag{152}$$

Then we have the isomorphism $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, 0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}\big({}_c\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big)$. Let us consider the case $c = 0$.

Lemma 7.61 *Let u be an element of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, 0)$. We have the relation $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda, u) = \mathfrak{t}\big(\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda, u)\big)$.*

Proof From the formula 2 and the inequality $-1 < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u) \leq 0$, we have the the following:

$$\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u) = \exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u), \quad \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u) \leq \mathrm{Re}\bigl(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr) < \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u)+1.$$

Thus we obtain the following, by definition of $\alpha(b,\omega)$:

$$\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u) = \alpha\bigl(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u),\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)\bigr).$$

We also obtain the following:

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u) = \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u) - \mathrm{Re}\bigl(\alpha(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u)),\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)\bigr) = d\bigl(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u),\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)\bigr).$$

It means $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u) = \mathfrak{t}\bigl(\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,u)\bigr)$. ∎

Lemma 7.62 *The image of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ via the morphism $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda)$ is $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}^f(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, and we have the equality: $\mathfrak{m}^f(\lambda,\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,u)) = \mathfrak{m}(\lambda,\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u))$.*

Proof From Proposition 7.6 and Lemma 7.61, the image of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,0)$ via the morphism $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda)$ is same as $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}^f(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, and we have the equality of the multiplicity. Note that we have the equalities $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,u+(1,0)) = \mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,u)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u)) = \mathfrak{m}\bigl(\lambda,\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u+(1,0))\bigr)$. Thus we are done. ∎

Lemma 7.63

1. *We have the $\mathbb{Z}$-action on $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$. The map $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda)$ induces the isomorphism $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0) \simeq \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}^f(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, which is also denoted by $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda)$.*
2. *We have $\mathfrak{m}(0,u) = \mathfrak{m}^f(\lambda,\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u))$.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 7.16 and Lemma 7.62. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. Then we have the numbers $a_i := \deg^{\mathcal{F}}(v_i)$ and $\omega_i := \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_i)$. Let c be any real number. Then we have the elements $u_i \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,c)$ such that $\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,u_i) = (a_i,\omega_i)$. We put $v_i := F(s_i, a_i - c)$, and then we obtain the frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i) \in {}_c\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ (See the subsubsection 7.4.5).

Lemma 7.64 *We have $\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u_i)$. We also have the following:*

$$\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v}\cdot\bigl(C+N\bigr)\cdot\frac{dz}{z}.$$

Here C denotes the diagonal matrix whose (i,i)-component is $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$, and N denotes the nilpotent matrix.

Proof As in Lemma 7.61, we can show $\alpha(a_i - c,\omega_i) = \lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$ and $-\mathrm{ord}(v_i) = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i)$. Then the claims follow from the results in the subsubsection 7.4.5. ∎

7.4.10 Genericity

We have the induced morphisms $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda) : \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda) : \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}p(M^\lambda)$.

Definition 7.7 *λ is called generic with respect to $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$, if the map $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda) : \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}p(M^\lambda)$ is bijective.* ∎

Remark 7.2 *We can consider $\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)$ instead of $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0)$.* ∎

Lemma 7.65 *Let S be the set of $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}$, which are generic with respect to $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$. Then the set $\boldsymbol{C}^* - S$ is discrete in $\boldsymbol{C}^*$. In particular, it is countable.*

Proof Let pick $u=(a,\alpha)$ and $v=(b,\beta)$ be elements of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$, such that $(a,\alpha)\neq(b,\beta)$. Let consider the following condition for λ:

$$\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,v).$$

It is equivalent to the following:

$$\lambda^{-1}\cdot(\alpha-\beta)-(a-b)-\lambda\cdot(\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\beta})\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

Let n be an integer. Let consider the following equation:

$$\lambda^{-1}\cdot(\alpha-\beta)-(a-b)-\lambda\cdot(\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\beta})=n. \tag{153}$$

Let $\lambda_i(n)$ $(i=1,2)$ be the solutions of the equation (153). Then we have the following relation:

$$|\lambda_1(n)\cdot\lambda_2(n)|=\left|-\frac{\alpha-\beta}{\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\beta}}\right|=1. \tag{154}$$

We also have the following:

$$\lambda_1(n)+\lambda_2(n)=\frac{-(a-b+n)}{\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\beta}}. \tag{155}$$

Then we obtain the following:

$$\lim_{|n|\to\infty}n^{-1}\cdot\bigl|\lambda_1(n)+\lambda_2(n)\bigr|=\bigl|\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\beta}\bigr|^{-1}\neq 0.$$

Hence the set of solutions of (154) is discrete in $\boldsymbol{C}^*$. Since $\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^0)$ is finite, the claim follows. ▮

Assume λ is generic. Then for any $\omega\in\mathcal{S}p(M^\lambda)$, there exists the unique element $u_0\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ satisfying $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u_0)=\omega$. Note that the parabolic structure of $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda),\omega)$ is trivial in the following sense: $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b\,\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda),\omega)\neq 0$ if and only if $b=\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u_0)$.

Lemma 7.66 *Let Z be a countable subset of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. Assume the following:*

> *For any $\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}^*-Z$, we know the set $\mathcal{S}p(M^\lambda)$ and the multiplicity of each element $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(M^\lambda)$.*

Then we know the set $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ and the multiplicities $\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,u)$ $(\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C},\ u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda))$.

Proof It follows from Lemma 7.65. ▮

7.4.11 Quasi canonical prolongment

Let b be a real number. We have the quasi canonical prolongment $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, that is, a holomorphic vector bundle over X satisfying the following:

- The restriction $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)_{|X-D}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.
- Let g be a holomorphic section of $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. Then $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$ gives a holomorphic section of $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)\otimes\Omega_X(\log D)$.
- Let β be an eigenvalue of the residue $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})$ on $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)_D$. Then the inequality $b\leq\mathrm{Re}(\beta)<b+1$ holds.

Recall that $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ is uniquely determined as the subsheaf of $j_*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, where j denotes the inclusion $X-D\longrightarrow X$.

We have the decomposition:

$$QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)=\bigoplus_\omega QC_b\bigl(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda,\omega)\bigr).$$

We have the natural filtration given by the following:

$$QC_b\bigl(F_a\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda,\omega)\bigr).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a base of $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. We put $v_i := F(s_i, b)$ and $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}$ gives a holomorphic frame of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over $X - D$. Let us consider the prolongment of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ by $\boldsymbol{v}$. Then it satisfies the conditions above. Hence $\boldsymbol{v}$ gives the holomorphic frame of $QC_b(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

Assume that λ is generic. Let us consider the following:

$$QC_0(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) := \bigoplus_{u \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0)} QC_0\big(\mathbb{E}\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)\big).$$

Lemma 7.67 *$QC_0\big(\mathbb{E}\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)\big) = {}_d\mathbb{E}\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)$. Here we put $d := \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha\big(0, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)\big)$.*

Proof Let s be a non-zero element of $\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)$. Then we have the following:

$$-\operatorname{ord}(F(s, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u))) = -\operatorname{ord}(s) - \mathrm{Re}(\alpha(0, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u))).$$

Then the claim follows, from the uniqueness of the quasi canonical prolongment [12]. ∎

Lemma 7.68 *We have the following relation:*

$${}_c\mathcal{E}^\lambda = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)} QC_0\big(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u))\big) \cdot z^{N(u)}.$$

Here we put $N(u) := \nu_c\Big(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha\big(0, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big)\big)\Big)$. (See the subsubsection 2.1.5 for ν_c).

Proof It follows from $c - 1 < -N(u) + d \leq c$. ∎

Remark 7.3 *The lemma says that quasi canonical prolongment is essentially same as the prolongment by an increasing order of the norms, in the case that λ is generic.* ∎

Remark 7.4 *For any point $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$, not necessarily generic, the vector bundle ${}_c\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is obtained from $QC_0(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ by a sequence of elementary transformations.* ∎

7.5 Family of multi-valued sections

7.5.1 The structure of holomorphic bundle

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$, and $\mathcal{E}$ be the deformed holomorphic bundle with λ-connection $\mathbb{D}$ over $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$. Let us consider the family of the multi-valued sections $\big\{H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \,\big|\, \lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\big\}$.

Let $\pi : \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow X - D$ is the universal covering, and let P be a point of $\mathbb{H}$ We have the holomorphic vector bundle $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{E}_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda \times \{P\}}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. Since we can pick the isomorphism $\mathcal{E}_{|(\lambda, P)} \simeq H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, we obtain the structure of holomorphic vector bundle on the family $\{H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\}$. The holomorphic vector bundle is denoted by $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})$ or simply by $\mathcal{H}$. Clearly the structure does not depend on choices of P and the isomorphism.

7.5.2 The $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$-decomposition

Pick $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. We have the monodromy M^{λ_0} on $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$. We put $S_0 := \mathcal{S}p(M^{\lambda_0})$. Pick a positive number ϵ_1 satisfying the following:

$$\epsilon_1 < \min\big\{|a - b| \,\big|\, a \neq b \in S_0\big\}.$$

Pick sufficiently small $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that we have the following decomposition on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{\omega \in S_0} \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega), \quad \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega) := \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \omega\big). \tag{156}$$

See (12) for the notation $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}$. The subset $\mathcal{S}(\omega) \subset \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)$ is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(\omega) := \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0)^{-1}(\omega) = \Big\{u \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0) \,\Big|\, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0, u) = \omega\Big\}.$$

We may assume that any point $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ are generic, due to Lemma 7.65. Then we have the following decomposition on the punctured disc $\Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{KMS}({}^\circ\mathcal{E}^0)} \mathcal{H}_u, \quad \mathcal{H}_{u\,|\,\lambda} := \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\bigr). \tag{157}$$

Lemma 7.69 *We have the following decomposition:*

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega)_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)} \mathcal{H}_u.$$

Proof It immediately follows from the definition of $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ in (156) and the decomposition (157). ∎

7.5.3 The filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$

We remark the following.

Lemma 7.70 *The map $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0) : \mathcal{S}(\omega) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ is injective.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 2.1. ∎

On the vector bundle $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega)_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, we have the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_d \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega)_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} := \bigoplus_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega),\\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u) \le d}} \mathcal{H}_u.$$

Lemma 7.71 *The above filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\omega\,|\,\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ can be prolonged to the filtration of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.*

Proof Since $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is defined by using the generalized eigen-decomposition of holomorphic endomorphisms M^λ, the claim holds. ∎

We denote the prolonged filtration also by $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Proposition 7.8 *We have the following equality:*

$$\Bigl(\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_d \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}, \omega)\Bigr)_{|\lambda_0} = \mathcal{F}_d\Bigl(\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}), \omega)\Bigr). \tag{158}$$

Proof We use the induction as is explained in the following. For any sufficiently small d, both of the sides in (158) are 0. Hence the equality (158) holds trivially. If the equality (158) holds for d, then (158) holds for $d+\eta$ for any sufficiently small $\eta > 0$. Hence we have only to show the following claim:

(C): Assume that (158) holds for any $d < d_0$. Then the equality (158) holds for d_0.

We assume that $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u_0) = d_0$ for $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)$. Note that the element u_0 is uniquely determined due to Lemma 7.70. We put $R := \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_d$. We have the natural isomorphism:

$$\bigwedge^R \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathcal{H}\bigl(\bigwedge^R \mathcal{E}\bigr). \tag{159}$$

We do not distinguish them in the following argument. We put as follows:

$$u_1 = \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)\\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u) \le d_0}} \mathfrak{m}(u, 0) \cdot u.$$

We put $d_1 := \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u_1)$.

Lemma 7.72 *Let* $a : \mathcal{S}(\omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *be a map satisfying the following conditions:*

$$a(u) \leq \mathfrak{m}(u,0), \qquad \sum a(u) = R.$$

Then we have the following inequality:

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)} a(u) \cdot \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u) \geq d_1. \tag{160}$$

The equality in (160) *holds if and only if* $\{a(u) \,|\, u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)\}$ *satisfies the following:*

$$a(u) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}(u,0) & \big(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u) \leq \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_0)\big), \\ 0 & \big(\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u) > \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_0)\big). \end{cases}$$

Proof It immediately follows from our choice of d_1. ∎

Lemma 7.73 *We have the following equality:*

$$\mathcal{F}_{d_1} \cap \bigwedge^R \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega\big) = \bigwedge^R \big(\mathcal{F}_{d_0}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega)\big), \qquad \mathcal{F}_{<d_1} \cap \bigwedge^R \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega\big) = 0. \tag{161}$$

In particular, the rank of $\mathcal{F}_{d_1} \cap \bigwedge^R \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega\big)$ *is one.*

Proof We put $R' := \operatorname{rank} \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega)$. Let $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_{R'})$ be a frame of $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega)$ which is compatible with $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbb{E}$. We may assume that $(s_1, \ldots, s_R)$ be a frame of $\mathcal{F}_{d_0}\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega\big)$. For any subset $I \subset \{1, \ldots, R'\}$, we put $s_I := \bigwedge_{i \in I} s_i$. Due to the norm estimate for the multi-valued sections (Proposition 7.7), the tuple $\big\{s_I \,\big|\, |I| = R\big\}$ gives the frame of $\bigwedge^R \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega)$, which is also compatible with the filtration $\mathcal{F}$, and we have the inequality $-\operatorname{ord}(s_I) = -\sum_{i \in I} \operatorname{ord}(s_i)$. Thus we obtain $-\operatorname{ord}(s_I) \geq d_1$, and the equality holds if and only if I is same as the set $\{1, \ldots, R\}$ due to Lemma 7.72. Then we obtain the equalities (161). ∎

We have the line subbundle $\mathcal{L} := \bigwedge^R \Big(\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d_0}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}),\omega)\Big)$ of $\bigwedge^R \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})$. Let us pick a non-trivial section s of $\mathcal{L}$ such that $s_{|\lambda_0} \neq 0$.

Lemma 7.74 *We have* $-\operatorname{ord}(s_{|\lambda_0}) \leq d_1$.

Proof For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, the element $s_{|\lambda} \in H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ is an eigenvector of M^λ, and the eigenvalue is $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u_1)$. We put as follows:

$$v := \exp\Big(\log z \cdot \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\Big) \cdot s.$$

Then it gives a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}$ defined over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times (X - D)$.

We may assume that any $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ is generic. Then we obtain the following equality for any point $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$$-\operatorname{ord}\big(v_{|\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)}\big) = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_1).$$

We also note that $|v|$ is bounded over the compact set $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \{|z| = 1/2\}$. Since $(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, h)$ is acceptable for any λ (Theorem 1 in [50], or Corollary 8.2 in this paper), there exists a positive constant $M > 0$ satisfying the following, due to Corollary 2.6:

- For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that the inequality $\big|v_{|\lambda}\big|_h \leq C_\epsilon \cdot |z|^{-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_1)} \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)^M$ holds for any $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Then we obtain the inequality for $\lambda = \lambda_0$:

$$\big|v_{|\lambda_0}\big|_h \leq C_\epsilon \cdot |z|^{-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_1)} \cdot \big(-\log|z|\big)^M$$

Hence we obtain the inequality $-\operatorname{ord}(v_{|\lambda_0}) \leq \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_1)$, and thus $-\operatorname{ord}(s_{|\lambda_0}) \leq \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, u_1) = d_1$. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 7.8. Due to Lemma 7.73 and 7.74, we obtain the following equality:

$$\bigwedge^{R}\Big(\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d_0}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\omega\big)\Big)_{|\lambda_0} = \bigwedge^{R}\Big(\mathcal{F}_{d_0}\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\omega\big)\Big).$$

It implies the equality (158) for d_0. Thus the proof of Proposition 7.8 is accomplished. ∎

7.5.4 The filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\mathcal{E}$

The filtrations and the decomposition for $\mathcal{H}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ induce those for $\mathcal{E}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times (X - D)$. We only summarize the result.

We have the following decomposition of the family of the λ-connections on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times (X - D)$:

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigoplus_{\omega \in S_0} \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega), \quad \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega) := \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}(\mathcal{E}, \omega).$$

Moreover we have the following decomposition on $\Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times (X - D)$:

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega)} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)).$$

On the vector bundle $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)$, we have the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- On $\Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times (X - D)$, we have the following splitting:

$$\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d}\big(\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)\big)_{|\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times(X-D)} = \bigoplus_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}(\omega) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u) \leq d}} \mathbb{E}\big(\mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u)\big).$$

- On $\{\lambda_0\} \times (X - D)$, we have the following:

$$\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d}\big(\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}, \omega)\big)_{|\{\lambda_0\}\times(X-D)} = \mathcal{F}_d(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, \omega)).$$

7.6 Asymptotic orthogonality

7.6.1 Asymptotic orthogonality for $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition of $\mathcal{E}^0$

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over Δ^*. Let ϵ_1 be a sufficiently small number, and C be a sufficiently small number. Then we have the following decomposition over $\Delta^*(C)$:

$$^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0 = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}p(\operatorname{Res}(\theta))} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}(^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0, \alpha). \tag{162}$$

See (12) for the notation $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}$.

Lemma 7.75 *There exists a positive constant ϵ_2 such that the decomposition is $|z|^{\epsilon_2}$-asymptotically orthogonal.*

Proof It is shown in Proposition 7.2. ∎

7.6.2 An asymptotically orthogonal decomposition of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$

Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ be generic. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a normalizing frame of $^\diamond\mathcal{E}$. We have the decomposition:

$$^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda = \bigoplus_{-1<b\leq 0}\Big(\bigoplus_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0) \\ \kappa(\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u))=b}} {}^\diamond\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u))\Big). \tag{163}$$

We would like to show that the decomposition above is $(-\log|z|)^{-1}$-asymptotically orthogonal.

The flat connection $\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}$ is given by $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}-\lambda^{-1}\cdot\psi$, where $\psi=\psi_0 dz/z$ is defined as in the formula (131). On the other hand, we have the unitary connection $\nabla^{\lambda}=\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger}+\partial_E-\bar{\lambda}\theta$.

We put $\Phi^{\lambda}:=\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}-\nabla^{\lambda}$. Then we have the following formula:

$$\Phi^{\lambda}=\Bigl(\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger}+\partial_E+\lambda^{-1}\theta-\lambda^{-1}\psi\Bigr)-\Bigl(\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger}+\partial_E-\bar{\lambda}\theta\Bigr)=\lambda^{-1}\Bigl((1+|\lambda|^2)\cdot\theta-\psi\Bigr). \tag{164}$$

Let η be a positive number. Let $M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})$ denote the monodromy of $\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}$ along the circle $|z|=\eta$.

Lemma 7.76 *There exists $C>0$ satisfying the following:*

$$\Bigl|\bigl(M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})u,M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})v\bigr)_h-(u,v)_h\Bigr|\leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}\cdot|u|\cdot|v|. \tag{165}$$

Proof We use the real coordinate (x,y) $(0\leq x<2\pi,\ 0<y)$ given by $z=\exp(\sqrt{-1}x-y)$. Let V denote the vector field given by $\partial/\partial x$. Let s be a flat section with respect to $\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}$ over $|z|=\eta$. It satisfies the following:

$$\frac{d}{dx}h(s,s)=2\operatorname{Re}\bigl(h(\nabla^{\lambda}_V(s),s)\bigr)=-2\operatorname{Re}\bigl(h(\Phi^{\lambda}_V(s),s)\bigr).$$

Hence we obtain the following:

$$\frac{d}{dx}\log|s|_h^2=-2\frac{\operatorname{Re}\bigl(h(\Phi^{\lambda}_V(s),s)\bigr)}{|s|_h^2}.$$

Due to the estimate (137), we have $|\Phi^{\lambda}_V|_h\leq C_0\cdot y_0$ for some $C_0>0$. Thus there exists a positive constant $C_1>0$, which is independent of x and y, and satisfying the following:

$$\left|\frac{d}{dx}\log|s(x,y)|_h^2\right|\leq C_1\cdot y^{-1}.$$

Hence there exists $C_2>0$ satisfying the following for any $0\leq x\leq 2\pi$ and for any $y>0$:

$$\bigl|s(x,y)\bigr|_h\leq C_2\cdot\bigl|s(0,y)\bigr|_h \tag{166}$$

On the other hand, we also have the following equality:

$$\frac{d}{dx}(s_1,s_2)_h=-(\Phi^{\lambda}_V s_1,s_2)_h-(s_1,\Phi^{\lambda}_V s_2)_h.$$

Then we obtain the following inequality from (137), (164) and (166):

$$\left|\frac{d}{dx}(s_1,s_2)_h\right|\leq C_3\cdot y^{-1}\cdot|s_1|_h\cdot|s_2|_h\leq C_4\cdot y^{-1}\cdot|s_1(0)|_h\cdot|s_2(0)|_h.$$

The inequality (165) immediately follows. ∎

We have the $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition of the flat bundles for the monodromy M^{λ}:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}=\bigoplus_{-1<b\leq 0}\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)\\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)=b}}\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u))\Bigr). \tag{167}$$

Lemma 7.77 *The decomposition* (167) *is the generalized eigen decomposition with respect to the monodromy $M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})$. Namely we have the following equality:*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)\\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)=b}}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u)\bigr)=\mathbb{E}\Bigl(M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}),\ \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}b)\Bigr).$$

Proof Since the endomorphism ψ_0 is flat with respect to $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$, we have the following:

$$M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}) = M(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}) \circ \exp\bigl(2\pi\lambda^{-1}\sqrt{-1}\psi_0\bigr).$$

Hence the eigenvalue of $M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})$ corresponding to v_i is as follows:

$$\exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta_i\bigr)\cdot\exp\bigl(2\pi\sqrt{-1}(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta_i+b_i)\bigr) = \exp\bigl(2\pi\sqrt{-1}b_i\bigr).$$

It implies the lemma. ▮

Lemma 7.78 *There exists a positive number $C>0$ such that the following holds for any i:*

$$\Bigl|M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})v_i - \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}b_i)v_i\Bigr|_h \leq C\cdot|v_i|\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}.$$

Proof We have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})v_i - \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}b_i)\cdot v_i &= \exp\bigl(2\pi\sqrt{-1}(b_i+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta_i)\bigr)\cdot\Bigl(M(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})\cdot v_i - \exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta_i)\cdot v_i\Bigr) \\ &= \exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}b_i)\cdot\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-2\pi)^n}{n!}(N^{\lambda}_{\omega_i})^n v_i. \qquad (168) \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $|(N^{\lambda}_{\omega_i})^n v_i| \leq C\cdot|v_i|\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}$, we obtain the result. ▮

Lemma 7.79 *There exists a positive number C satisfying the following:*

> *Let γ_i $(i=1,2)$ be elements of $\mathcal{S}p(M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}))$, and u_i be elements of $\mathbb{E}(M_{\eta}(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}),\gamma_i)$. If $\gamma_1\neq\gamma_2$, then the following holds:*
>
> $$\bigl|(u_1,u_2)_h\bigr| \leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}\cdot|u_1|_h\cdot|u_2|_h. \qquad (169)$$

Namely the generalized eigen-decomposition of the monodromy of $\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda}$ is $(-\log|z|)^{-1}$-asymptotically orthogonal.

Proof Due to Lemma 7.76, we have the following inequality:

$$\Bigl|\bigl(M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})\cdot u_1, M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})\cdot u_2\bigr)_h - (u_1,u_2)_h\Bigr| \leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}\cdot|u_1|_h\cdot|u_2|_h. \qquad (170)$$

On the other hand, we have the following inequality due to Lemma 7.78:

$$\begin{aligned} \Bigl|\bigl(M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})u,\ M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})v\bigr)_h - \gamma_1\cdot\bar{\gamma}_2\cdot(u,v)_h\Bigr| &= \Bigl|\bigl((M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})-\gamma_1)u,\ M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})v\bigr)_h + \bigl(\gamma_1\cdot u,\ (M(\tilde{\nabla}^{\lambda})-\gamma_2)v\bigr)\Bigr| \\ &\leq C'\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}\cdot|u|\cdot|v|. \qquad (171) \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $|\gamma_i|=1$, the condition $\gamma_1\neq\gamma_2$ implies $\gamma_1\cdot\bar{\gamma}_2\neq 1$. Hence we obtain the inequality (169) from (170) and (171). ▮

7.6.3 Asymptotic orthogonality for the parabolic filtration of $\mathcal{E}^0$

Lemma 7.80 *We pick $\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}$ satisfying the following:*

1. *λ is generic (Definition 7.7).*
2. *$u\neq u' \Longrightarrow \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)\neq\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u')$.*

Proof Note $|\lambda|$ is sufficiently small, we may always assume the second condition holds. ▮

Let us pick λ as in Lemma 7.80. Let $\boldsymbol{e}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^0$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W. We put $b(e_i)=\deg^F(e_i)$ and $b(v_i)=\deg^F(v_i)$. We put $k(e_i)=\deg^W(e_i)$ and $k(v_i)=\deg^W(v_i)$. We put $u(e_i)=\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(e_i)$ and $u(v_i)=\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(v_i)$.

We put $e'_i := e_i \cdot |z|^{b(e_i)} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k(e_i)/2}$ and $v'_i := v_i \cdot |z|^{b(v_i)} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-k(v_i)/2}$. We have the bounded C^∞-function $B : X - D \longrightarrow M(r)$ determined by the following:

$$e'_i = \sum_j B'_{j\,i} \cdot v'_j.$$

Recall that $|B'_{j\,i}| \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$ unless $\mathfrak{k}\bigl(\lambda, u(e_i)\bigr) = u(v_j)$ (Corollary 7.17).

Lemma 7.81 *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ satisfying the following condition:*

> *In the case $u(e_i) \neq u(e_j)$, the inequality $\bigl|(e_i, e_j)_h\bigr| \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1} \cdot |e_i|_h \cdot |e_j|_h$ holds for some positive constant C.*

Proof We have already obtained stronger estimate in the case $\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(e_i) \neq \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(e_j)$ (Lemma 7.75). We have only to prove the following estimate, for some positive number C_1 in the case $b(e_i) \neq b(e_j)$:

$$\bigl|(e'_i, e'_j)_h\bigr| \leq C_1 \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}.$$

We have the following formula:

$$(e'_i, e'_j)_h = \sum B'_{k\,i} \cdot \bar{B}'_{l\,j} \cdot (v'_k, v'_l)_h. \tag{172}$$

We have the inequality $|B'_{k\,i}| \cdot |\bar{B}'_{l\,j}| < C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$, unless the following condition holds:

$$\mathfrak{k}\bigl(\lambda, u(e_i)\bigr) = u(v_k), \quad \mathfrak{k}\bigl(\lambda, u(e_j)\bigr) = u(v_l). \tag{173}$$

Assume that $b(e_i) \neq b(e_j)$ and the equalities (173) hold. Then we have $b(v_k) \neq b(v_l)$ due to our choice of λ. Thus we obtain the inequality $(v'_k, v'_l)_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$ for some positive constant C. Hence the right hand side in (172) is dominated by $(-\log|z|)^{-1}$. ∎

Let us take a decomposition of the vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0, \alpha)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0, \alpha) = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)} V_{(a,\alpha)}. \tag{174}$$

We assume that the decomposition gives a splitting of the parabolic filtration F, in the following sense:

$$F_a({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0{}_{|O}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha} \bigoplus_{b \leq a} V_{b,\alpha\,|\,O}. \tag{175}$$

For example, we can pick V_a as the vector subbundle of $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}, \alpha)$ generated by $\bigl\{e_i \,\big|\, u(e_i) = (a, \alpha)\bigr\}$. On the other hand, if we are given such decomposition, then we can pick the frame $\boldsymbol{e}$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W such that V_a is generated by $\bigl\{e_i \,\big|\, u(e_i) = (a, \alpha)\bigr\}$.

Proposition 7.9 *If the condition* (175) *is satisfied, then the decomposition* (174) *is $(-\log|z|)^{-1}$-asymptotically orthogonal.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 7.81. ∎

7.6.4 Asymptotic orthogonality for the weight filtration

Let $(E_0, \overline{\partial}_{E_0}, \theta_0, h_0)$ be a model bundle for $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$. We use the notation in the subsection 7.3. Recall the finiteness due to Simpson (Lemma 7.38):

$$\int |\theta^\dagger - \theta_0^\dagger|_h^2 \cdot \bigl(-|z| \cdot \log|z|\bigr) \cdot \frac{|dz \cdot d\bar{z}|}{|z|^2(-\log|z|)} < \infty.$$

Hence, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a subset $Z_\epsilon \subset X - D$ satisfying the following:

- The volume of $(X-D)-Z_\epsilon$ with respect to the measure $|dz\cdot d\bar{z}|\cdot|z|^{-2}(-\log|z|)^{-1}$ is finite.
- We have the estimate $|\theta^\dagger-\theta_0^\dagger|_h\cdot\bigl(-|z|\log|z|\bigr)\leq\epsilon$ on Z_ϵ.

The endomorphisms A_0 and A are determined by the following:

$$A_0\cdot\frac{dz\cdot d\bar{z}}{|z|^2(-\log|z|)^2}=\theta_0\cdot\theta_0^\dagger+\theta_0^\dagger\cdot\theta_0,\qquad A\cdot\frac{dz\cdot d\bar{z}}{|z|^2(-\log|z|)^2}=\theta\cdot\theta^\dagger+\theta^\dagger\cdot\theta.$$

Then A_0 is self dual with respect to h_0, and A is self dual with respect to h. By a direct calculation, it can be checked that the eigenvalues of A_0 are integers.

We have the decomposition $E_0=\bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}U_k$ satisfying the following:

- $W_k=\bigoplus_{h\leq k}U_h$.
- U_k is eigen space of A_0 corresponding to the integer k.

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 7.82

- *There exists $C_4>0$ such that $|\theta-\theta_0|_h\cdot(-|z|\log|z|)\leq C_4\cdot|z|^{1/2}$.*
- *There exists $C_5>0$ the inequality $|A_0-A|_h\leq C_5\cdot\epsilon_1$ holds on $Z_{\epsilon_1}\cap\Delta^*(\epsilon_2)$.* ▮

Let us take sufficiently small positive number ϵ_1 such that $5\cdot\epsilon_1<|\phi(k)-\phi(k-1)|$. Let v_i be a C^∞-section of U_{k_i} for $k_1\neq k_2$. Since A is anti-self dual with respect to h, we have $(Av_1,v_2)_h+(v_1,Av_2)_h=0$.

On the other hand, we have the following:

$$|A\cdot v_i-k_i\cdot v_i|_h=|A\cdot v_i-A_0\cdot v_i|_h\leq C_5\cdot\epsilon\cdot|v|_h.$$

Then we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\bigl|k_1-k_2\bigr|\cdot\Bigl|(v_1,v_2)_h\Bigr|&=\Bigl|\bigl(k_1\cdot v_1,v_2\bigr)_h-\bigl(v_1,k_2\cdot v_2\bigr)_h\Bigr|\\&=\Bigl|\bigl((k_1-A)v_1,v_2\bigr)_h-\bigl(v_1,(k_2-A)v_2\bigr)_h\Bigr|\leq 2C_5\cdot\epsilon\cdot|v_1|_h\cdot|v_2|_h.\end{aligned}\tag{176}$$

Here we have used the self-duality of A with respect to h. Hence we obtain the inequality $\bigl|(v_1,v_2)_h\bigr|\leq C_6\cdot\epsilon\cdot|v_1|_h\cdot|v_2|_h$. In all, we obtain the following.

Proposition 7.10 *For any $\epsilon>0$, there exists a subset $Z_\epsilon\subset X-D$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- *The measure of $(X-D)-Z_\epsilon$ with respect to $|dz\cdot d\bar{z}|\cdot|z|^{-2}(\log|z|)^{-1}$ is finite.*
- *Let $v,w\in{}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0$ such that $\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(v)=\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}(w)$ and $\deg^W(v)\neq\deg^W(w)$. On Z_ϵ, we have the estimate $|(v,w)|\leq\epsilon\cdot|v|_h\cdot|w|_h$.* ▮

7.7 Maximum principle for the distance of the harmonic metrics

Let $(E^{(i)},\overline{\partial}_{E^{(i)}},h^{(i)},\theta^{(i)})$ $(i=1,2)$ be tame harmonic bundles on $\overline{\Delta}^*$ of rank r. We denote the corresponding λ-connections by $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(i)\,\lambda},\mathbb{D}^\lambda\bigr)$. Assume the following:

- The set of KMS-spectrum are same, i.e., $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,0})=\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,0})$.
- Let λ be a complex number which is generic with respect to $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{(i)\,0})$, and we are given a flat isomorphism $\Phi:\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda},\mathbb{D}^\lambda\bigr)\longrightarrow\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda},\mathbb{D}^\lambda\bigr)$.

Lemma 7.83 *The functions $\log|\Phi|^2$ and $\log|\Phi^{-1}|^2$ are subharmonic on the disc Δ.*

Proof First, let us see the boundedness of Φ and Φ^{-1}. Since λ is generic, the harmonic metrics h_i of $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(i)\,\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\bigr)$ are determined by the monodromy, up to boundedness. Use the result in the subsubsection 4.3.3 in [38], and note that the splitting of the parabolic structure is given by the generalized eigen-decomposition of the residues.

We have the inequality $\Delta \log|\Phi|^2 \leq 0$ and $\Delta \log|\Phi^{-1}|^2 \leq 0$ on the punctured disc Δ^*, due to the Weitzenbeck formula of Simpson (Lemma 4.1 in [50]). Since $\log|\Phi|^2$ and $\log|\Phi^{-1}|^2$ are bounded, the inequalities hold on the disc Δ. (See Lemma 2.2 in [50].) Thus we are done. ■

We identify $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\bigr)$ and $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(2)}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\bigr)$ via the morphism Φ. For any point $P \in \overline{\Delta}^*$, we can consider the distance of $h_{1\,|\,P}$ and $h_{2\,|\,P}$ in the space $\mathcal{PH}(r)$ (the subsubsection 2.6.5).

Lemma 7.84 *Let R be a real number such that the inequality $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{1\,|\,Q}, h_{2\,|\,Q}\bigr) \leq R$ hold for any point $Q \in \partial\overline{\Delta}$. Then the following inequalities hold for any point $P \in \overline{\Delta}^*$:*

$$d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{1\,|\,P}, h_{2\,|\,P}\bigr) \leq \left(\frac{e^R - e^{-R}}{2R}\right) \cdot \max\Bigl\{ d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{1\,|\,Q}, h_{2\,|\,Q}\bigr) \Bigm| Q \in \partial\overline{\Delta} \Bigr\}. \tag{177}$$

Proof We always have the following, due to Lemma 2.27:

$$d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{1\,|\,P}, h_{2\,|\,P}\bigr) \leq \frac{|\Phi_{|P}|^2 + |\Phi^{-1}_{|P}|^2 - 2r}{2}. \tag{178}$$

For any point $Q \in \partial X$, we have the following, due to Lemma 2.27 again:

$$\frac{|\Phi_{|Q}|^2 + |\Phi^{-1}_{|Q}|^2 - 2r}{2} \leq \frac{e^R - e^{-R}}{2R} \cdot d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{1\,|\,Q}, h_{2\,|\,Q}\bigr). \tag{179}$$

Then (177) follows from the inequalities (178), (179) and Lemma 7.83. ■

8 Harmonic bundles on $\Delta^{*\,l} \times \Delta^{n-l}$

8.1 Preliminary

8.1.1 KMS-Spectrum

We put $X := \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. Let π_i denote the projection $X \longrightarrow D_i$, forgetting the i-th component. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. We have the deformed holomorphic bundle $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$. Let i be an element of $\underline{l}$, and P be a point of $D_i^{\circ} := D_i - \bigcup_{j \neq i,\ 1 \leq j \leq l} D_i \cap D_j$. We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P) := \mathcal{KMS}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr).$$

Lemma 8.1 *The set $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P)$ and the multiplicities of any element $u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P)$ are independent of $P \in D_i^{\circ}$.*

Proof Let P_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be points of D_i°. For any $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}$, we have $\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P_1) = \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P_2)$, and the multiplicities are same. Then we obtain the result due to Lemma 7.66. ■

In the following, we use the notation $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ instead of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i, P)$. Similarly, the sets $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$, $\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ and $\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ are obtained.

For any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$, the sets $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i) := \mathcal{KMS}\bigl({}_{b_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)\bigr)$ are also obtained, where b_i denotes the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{b}$.

Let us consider the Higgs field:

$$\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{l} f_i \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i} + \sum_{j=l+1}^{n} g_j \cdot dz_j.$$

We have the characteristic polynomials $\det(t - f_i)$ and $\det(t - g_j)$, whose coefficients are holomorphic functions defined over $X - D$. Since our harmonic bundle is tame, the coefficients are prolonged to the holomorphic functions defined over X, by definition. We denote them by the same notation.

Lemma 8.2 *We have* $\det(t-f_i)_{|P_1}=\det(t-f_i)_{|P_2}$ *if* $P_a\in D_i$ $(a=1,2)$.

Proof If $P\in D_i^{\circ}$, then we have $\det(t-f_i)_{|P}=\det\bigl(t-f_{i\,|\,\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)_{|P}$. Due to Lemma 8.1, the right hand side is independent of a choice of a point $P\in D_i^{\circ}$. Then we obtain the result for D_i. ∎

8.1.2 Rank 1

Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle of rank 1 over $X-D$. In this case, the set $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$ consists of only one element u_i for $i=1,\ldots,l$. We have the model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{u})$ for $\boldsymbol{u}=(u_1,\ldots,u_l)$. Then $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)\otimes L(\boldsymbol{u})$ is tame and nilpotent. Moreover the parabolic structure is trivial. Hence it is the restriction of the harmonic bundle $(E_0,\overline{\partial}_{E_0},\theta_0,h_0)$ of rank 1 over X, due to Corollary 4.10 in [38]. Namely we obtain the following.

Proposition 8.1 *Let* $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ *be a tame harmonic bundle over* $X-D$ *of rank* 1*. Then it is isomorphic to the tensor product of a model bundle* $L(\boldsymbol{u})$ *and a harmonic bundle* $(E_0,\overline{\partial}_{E_0},h_0,\theta_0)$ *over* X*.* ∎

8.1.3 A characterization of tameness

Lemma 8.3 *Let* X *be a simply connected compact region of* $\boldsymbol{C}^n$*. Let* $\pi:X\times\overline{\Delta}^*\longrightarrow X$ *denote the projection. Let* $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ *be a harmonic bundle on* $X\times\overline{\Delta}^*$*. Assume the following:*

- *For any point* $P\in X$*, the restriction* $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$ *is tame with respect to* (P,O)*.*

Then the harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ *is tame with respect to the divisor* $X\times\{O\}$*.*

Proof Let $(z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ be the coordinate of X, and w be the coordinate of $\overline{\Delta}$. We have the description $\theta=\sum_{i=1}^n g_i\cdot dz_i+f\cdot dw/w$. We would like to show that the coefficients of $\det(t-f)$ and $\det(t-g_i)$ are holomorphic on $X\times\overline{\Delta}$. Due to our assumption, the coefficients of $\det(t-f)_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$ is holomorphic for any $P\in X$. Then it is easy to derive that the coefficients of $\det(t-f)$ is holomorphic on $X\times\overline{\Delta}$. So we have only to see $\det(t-g_i)$.

We remark that $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0_{|\pi^{-1}(P)})$ is independent of a choice of $P\in X$, which can be shown by the same argument as the proof of Lemma 8.1. Let us take a complex number λ, which is generic with respect to $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0_{\pi^{-1}(P)})$. We have the flat bundle $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\bigr)$ on $X\times\overline{\Delta}^*$. In particular, we have the following flat isomorphism for any points $P_1,P_2\in X$:

$$\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\bigr)_{|\pi^{-1}(P_1)}\simeq\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\bigr)_{\pi^{-1}(P_2)}. \tag{180}$$

We put $h_P:=h_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$. For any point $Q\in\overline{\Delta}^*$, we can consider the distance $d_{\mathcal{PH}(r)}\bigl(h_{P_1\,|\,Q},h_{P_2\,|\,Q}\bigr)$ for any points $P_i\in X$, via the isomorphism (180).

Let P_0 be a point of X, and v be a real tangent vector of X at P_0. It naturally gives the tangent vector v_Q of $X\times\overline{\Delta}^*$ at (P,Q) for any point $Q\in\overline{\Delta}^*$. From Lemma 7.84 and the formula (34), we obtain the following maximum principle:

$$\bigl|\overline{\lambda}\cdot\theta(v_Q)+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}(v_Q)\bigr|^2\leq\max\Bigl\{\bigl|\overline{\lambda}\cdot\theta(v_{Q'})+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}(v_{Q'})\bigr|^2\,\Big|\,Q'\in\partial\overline{\Delta}\Bigr\}. \tag{181}$$

Note $(2R)^{-1}\cdot(e^R-e^{-R})$ goes to 1 when R goes to 0.

Let us use the real coordinate $z_i=x_i+\sqrt{-1}y_i$. Let ∂_{x_i} and ∂_{y_i} denote the vector fields $\partial/\partial x_i$ and $\partial/\partial y_i$. Since $X\times\partial\overline{\Delta}$ is compact, we obtain the boundedness of the following, from (181):

$$\overline{\lambda}\cdot\theta\bigl(\partial_{x_i}\bigr)+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}\bigl(\partial_{x_i}\bigr)=\overline{\lambda}\cdot g_i+\lambda\cdot g_i^{\dagger}.$$

$$\overline{\lambda}\cdot\theta\bigl(\partial_{y_i}\bigr)+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}\bigl(\partial_{y_i}\bigr)=\overline{\lambda}\cdot g_i-\lambda\cdot g_i^{\dagger}.$$

Hence we obtain the boundedness of g_i.

Then we obtain the boundedness of the coefficients of $\det(t-g_i)$, which implies that they are holomorphic on $X\times\overline{\Delta}$. ∎

Lemma 8.4 *We put* $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ *and* $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. *Let* π_i *denote the naturally defined projection* $X \longrightarrow D_i$. *Let* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ *be a harmonic bundle on* $X - D$. *Assume the following:*

- *For any point* $Q \in D_i \setminus \bigcup_{j\neq i} D_j$, *the restriction* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)_{|\pi^{-1}(Q)}$ *is tame.*

Then the harmonic bundle is tame with respect to the divisor D.

Proof We put $D^{[2]} := \bigcup_{i\neq j} D_i \cap D_j$, which is of codimension 2 in X. We have the description:

$$\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{l} f_i \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i} + \sum_{i=l+1}^{n} g_i \cdot dz_i.$$

Due to Lemma 8.3, the coefficients of $\det(t - f_i)$ and $\det(t - g_i)$ are holomorphic on $X - D^{[2]}$. Then we can conclude that they are holomorphic on X due to the theorem of Hartogs. ▮

We have a straightforward corollary.

Corollary 8.1 *Let* X *be a complex manifold, and* D *be a normal crossing divisor of* X. *Let* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ *be a harmonic bundle on* $X - D$. *Assume the following:*

- *For any smooth curve* C *be contained in* X, *which intersects with the smooth parts of* D *transversely, the restriction* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)_{|C}$ *is tame.*

Then the harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ *is tame.* ▮

8.2 Simpson's Main estimate in higher dimensional case

8.2.1 Preliminary decomposition

Pick a positive number ϵ_1. If we replace X by a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin O, and if we replace the coordinate appropriately, then we may assume that there exist positive constants ϵ, ϵ_1 and C, satisfying the following conditions:

- We have the decomposition $E = \bigoplus_{a\in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0,i)} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}(f_i, a)$ over $X - D$.
- Then we have the decomposition $f_i = \bigoplus_{a\in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0,i)} f_{i\,a}$. Then we have the inequality $|\alpha - a| < C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon}$ for any eigenvalue of $f_{i\,a}$.

By tensoring some model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{u})$ of rank 1, we may also assume that $\sum_{a\in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0,i)} |a|^2 \neq 0$ for any i.

Since f_k $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ and g_j $(j = l+1, \ldots, n)$ are commutative, $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}(f_i, a)$ are preserved by f_k and g_j. By an inductive procedure, we may assume the following:

Condition 8.1

- *The subset* $\mathcal{S}p(\theta) \subset \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ *is given.*
- *The holomorphic decomposition* $E = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in \mathcal{S}p(\theta)} E_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *is given.*
- *Each* $E_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ *is preserved by* f_k $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ *and* g_j $(j = l+1, \ldots, n)$. *Hence we have the decompositions*

$$f_i = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in \mathcal{S}p(\theta)} f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}}, \quad f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}} \in End(E_{\boldsymbol{a}}),$$

$$g_j = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in \mathcal{S}p(\theta)} g_{j\,\boldsymbol{a}}, \quad g_{j\,\boldsymbol{a}} \in End(E_{\boldsymbol{a}}).$$

- *There exist positive constants* ϵ *and* C *such that the inequality* $|\alpha - q_i(\boldsymbol{a})| \leq C \cdot |z|^{\epsilon}$ *holds for any eigenvalue* α *of* $f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}}$. *Here* q_i *denotes the projection onto the* i*-th component.*
- *We have* $\sum_{a\in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^0,i)} |a|^2 \neq 0$. ▮

Using Lemma 2.22 inductively, we obtain the following.

Lemma 8.5

- *We put* $h_0 := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{S}p(\theta)} h_{|E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}$. *Then* h_0 *and* h *are mutually bounded.*
- *Namely there exists positive constants* C_1 *and* C_2 *such that the following inequalities hold for any section* $v=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{S}p(\theta)} v_{\boldsymbol{a}}$*:*

$$C_1 \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{S}p(\theta)} |v_{\boldsymbol{a}}|_h \leq |v|_h \leq C_2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{S}p(\theta)} |v_{\boldsymbol{a}}|_h.$$

▮

We put ${}^iE_a = \bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{a})=a} E_{\boldsymbol{a}}$. We have two metrics on ${}^iE_a$: that is, $h_{|{}^iE_a}$ and $\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{a})=a} h_{|E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}$.

Lemma 8.6 *The metrics* $h_{|{}^iE_a}$ *and* $\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{a})=a} h_{|E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}$ *are mutually bounded.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 2.22. ▮

8.2.2 Inequalities

The restriction of f_i to ${}^jE_a$ is denoted by ${}^jf_{i\,a}$.

Lemma 8.7 *We have the following inequalities for a positive constant* C *and for any* $\boldsymbol{a}$*:*

$$|{}^if_{i\,a} - a\cdot id_{{}^iE_a}|_h \leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}. \tag{182}$$

Proof It follows from Corollary 7.4. ▮

Lemma 8.8 *We have the following inequality for some positive constant* C'*:*

$$|f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}} - q_i(\boldsymbol{a})\cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}|_h \leq C'\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}. \tag{183}$$

Proof The estimate (183) follows from (182) and Lemma 8.6. ▮

We have the decomposition $g_j = \bigoplus g_{j\,\boldsymbol{a}}$, where $g_{j\,\boldsymbol{a}} \in End(E_{\boldsymbol{a}})$. The following lemma is easy.

Lemma 8.9 *We have* $|g_{j\,\boldsymbol{a}}|_h \leq C$ *for some positive constant* C. ▮

We have the adjoint maps $f_i^{\dagger}$ and the decomposition $f_i^{\dagger} = \sum (f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}$, where $(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \in Hom(E_{\boldsymbol{a}}, E_{\boldsymbol{b}})$. We also have the adjoint $g_j^{\dagger}$ and the decomposition $g_j^{\dagger} = \sum (g_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}$, where $(g_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \in Hom(E_{\boldsymbol{a}}, E_{\boldsymbol{b}})$.

For any elements $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ of $\boldsymbol{C}^l$, we put $\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) := \{j \,|\, q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b})\}$.

Lemma 8.10 *There exist positive constant* C *and* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that the following holds:*

(A) $\big|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{a}} - \overline{q_i(\boldsymbol{a})}\cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}\big|_h \leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}$.

(B) *If* $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ *and* $\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b}$, *we have the following inequality:*

$$\big|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h \leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}\cdot \prod_{j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_j|^{\epsilon}.$$

(C) *If* $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$, *then we have the following inequality:*

$$\big|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h \leq C\cdot \prod_{j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_j|^{\epsilon}.$$

(D) *We have the following inequality:*

$$\big|(g_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h \leq C\cdot \prod_{k\in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_k|^{\epsilon}.$$

Proof We put $\rho_i := \sum_a a\cdot id_{{}^iE_a}$, and $\bar{\rho}_i := \sum_a \bar{a}\cdot id_{{}^iE_a}$. We denote the adjoint of ρ_i by $\rho_i^{\dagger}$. Due to the result in the case of curves, we obtain the following:

- $|\rho_i^{\dagger}-\bar{\rho}_i|_h \leq C\cdot |z_i|^{\epsilon}$, (Lemma 7.24).
- $|f_i-\rho_i|_h\leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}$, (Corollary 7.3).

In particular, we have $|f_i^{\dagger}-\bar{\rho}_i|_h\leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}$. It implies (A).

We also have the following decomposition for $j\neq i$:

$$(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}=\sum {}^j(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{a,b},\qquad {}^j(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{a,b}\in Hom({}^jE_a,{}^jE_b).$$

We have the following inequalities due to Lemma 2.22 and Lemma 2.23:

$$\big|{}^j(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{a\,b}\big|_h\leq C\cdot|z_j|^{\epsilon}\cdot|f_i-\rho_i|_h\leq C\cdot|z_j|^{\epsilon}\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1},\quad (a\neq b)$$

$$\big|{}^j(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{a\,a}\big|_h\leq C\cdot|f_i-\rho_i|_h\leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1},\qquad (a=b)$$

Due to Lemma 8.6, there exist positive constants C and ϵ such that the following holds:

$$\big|(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h\leq\begin{cases} C\cdot|z_j|^{\epsilon}\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}, & (q_j(\boldsymbol{a})\neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b}))\\ C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}, & (q_j(\boldsymbol{a})=q_j(\boldsymbol{b})).\end{cases}\tag{184}$$

For any subset $I\subset \underline{l}$ and for any positive number ϵ, there exists a positive number ϵ' such that the following inequality holds:

$$\min\big\{|z_i|^{\epsilon}\,\big|\,i\in I\big\}\leq\prod_{i\in I}|z_i|^{\epsilon'}.\tag{185}$$

From (184) and (185), we obtain the following inequality, for some sufficiently small $\epsilon>0$:

$$\big|(f_i-\rho_i)^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h\leq C\cdot(-\log|z_i|)^{-1}\cdot\prod_{\substack{j\neq i,\\ j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}}|z_j|^{\epsilon}.\tag{186}$$

Similarly we have the following:

$$|(\rho_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}|_h\leq\begin{cases} C\cdot|z_j|^{\epsilon} & \text{if } q_j(\boldsymbol{a})\neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b})\\ C & \text{if } q_j(\boldsymbol{a})=q_j(\boldsymbol{b}).\end{cases}$$

By definition, we have $\bar{\rho}_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}=0$ if $\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b}$. We also have the following for any $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ from Lemma 7.24:

$$\big|(\rho_i^{\dagger}-\bar{\rho}_i)_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h\leq C\cdot|z_i|^{\epsilon}.$$

In all, we obtain the following for some positive constants C and ϵ:

$$|(\rho_i^{\dagger}-\bar{\rho})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}|_h\leq C\cdot|z_i|^{\epsilon}\cdot\prod_{\substack{j\neq i\\ j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}}|z_j|^{\epsilon}.\tag{187}$$

Hence, in the case $\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b}$, we obtain the following inequality from (186), (187) and $\bar{\rho}_{i\,\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}=0$ $(\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b})$:

$$|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}|_h\leq C\cdot(-\log|z_j|)^{-1}\cdot\prod_{\substack{j\neq i\\ j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}}|z_j|^{\epsilon}.$$

It implies the claim (B).

In the case $j \neq i$, we have the following for some positive constants C and ϵ:

$$\big|{}^{j}(f_i^{\dagger})_{a,b}\big|_h \leq \begin{cases} C \cdot |z_j|^{\epsilon}, & (a \neq b), \\ C, & (a = b). \end{cases} \tag{188}$$

From (188) and (185), we obtain the following estimate, for some positive constants C and ϵ:

$$\big|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h \leq \begin{cases} C \cdot |z_j|^{\epsilon}, & \big(q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b})\big) \\ C, & \big(q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_j(\boldsymbol{b})\big). \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$, we have the following for some positive constants C and ϵ:

$$\big|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}\big|_h \leq C \cdot |z_i|^{\epsilon}.$$

In all, we obtain the following inequality for some positive constants C and ϵ, if $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$:

$$|(f_i^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}|_h \leq C \cdot \prod_{j \in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_j|^{\epsilon}$$

Hence we obtain the claim (C).

The claim (D) can be obtained similarly. ∎

8.2.3 Some consequences

Let $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ be elements of $\mathcal{S}p(\theta)$. We put as follows:

$$F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})} := f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}} \circ (f_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{b}\,\boldsymbol{a}} - (f_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{b}\,\boldsymbol{a}} \circ f_{i\,\boldsymbol{b}}.$$

Lemma 8.11 *There exist positive constants C and ϵ such that the following inequalities hold:*
The case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_j(\boldsymbol{b})$:

$$|F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})}|_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z_i|)^{-1} \cdot (-\log|z_j|)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_k|^{\epsilon}.$$

The case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b})$:

$$|F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})}|_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z_i|)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_k|^{\epsilon}.$$

The case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) \neq q_j(\boldsymbol{b})$:

$$|F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})}|_h \leq C \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_k|^{\epsilon}.$$

Proof Let us consider the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) = d$. We put $\delta_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}} := 1$ $(\boldsymbol{a} \neq \boldsymbol{b})$, or $\delta_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}} := 0$ $(\boldsymbol{a} \neq \boldsymbol{b})$. Then we have the following:

$$F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})} = \Big(f_{i\,\boldsymbol{a}} - c \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}}\Big) \circ \Big((f_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{a}} - \bar{d} \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}}\Big) - \Big((f_j^{\dagger})_{\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{a}} - \bar{d} \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}}\Big) \circ \Big(f_{i\,\boldsymbol{b}} - c \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}}\Big).$$

Therefore we obtain the following inequality:

$$|F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})}|_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z_i|)^{-1} \cdot (-\log|z_j|)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{k \in \mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})} |z_k|^{\epsilon}.$$

Thus we are done in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{b})$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{a}) = q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) = d$. The rest cases can be shown similarly. ∎

Proposition 8.2 *The two form* $\theta \wedge \theta^{\dagger} + \theta^{\dagger} \wedge \theta$ *is dominated by the Kahler form of the Poincaré metric:*

$$\omega_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{dz_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i}{|z_i|^2(-\log|z_i|)^2} + \sum_{i=l+1}^{n} \frac{dz_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i}{(1-|z_i|^2)^2}.$$

Proof The contributions of $f_i \cdot dz_i/z_i$ and $f_j^{\dagger} \cdot d\bar{z}_j/d\bar{z}_j$ to the form $\theta \wedge \theta^{\dagger} + \theta^{\dagger} \wedge \theta$ is a sum of the following forms:

$$F_{(i,\boldsymbol{a}),(j,\boldsymbol{b})} \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i} \wedge \frac{d\bar{z}_j}{\bar{z}_j}.$$

Then it is dominated by the form $q_i^* \omega_{\Delta^*} + q_j^* \omega_{\Delta^*}$. The rest terms can be dominated similarly. ∎

We have the unitary connection of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ given by the following:

$$\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} + \partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} = \overline{\partial}_E + \partial_E + \lambda \cdot \theta^{\dagger} - \bar{\lambda} \cdot \theta.$$

The curvature $R(\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} + \partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}})$ is as follows:

$$\big(1+|\lambda|^2\big) \cdot \big(\theta \wedge \theta^{\dagger} + \theta^{\dagger} \wedge \theta\big).$$

Corollary 8.2 *The curvature* $R(\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} + \partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}})$ *is dominated by* $\omega_{\mathbf{p}}$*. Namely, the hermitian holomorphic bundle* $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, h)$ *is acceptable.*

Proof It follows from Proposition 8.2. ∎

Remark 8.1 *The curvature of the hermitian holomorphic bundle* $(\mathcal{E}, h)$ *over* $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D}$ *contains the terms of the following form:*

$$-d\overline{\lambda} \wedge \theta + d\lambda \wedge \theta^{\dagger}.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{E}, h)$ *is not acceptable, unless* θ *is nilpotent.* ∎

8.3 Prolongation in the case that λ is generic

8.3.1 The quasi canonical prolongation

Definition 7.7 is generalized as follows.

Definition 8.1 λ *is called generic with respect to* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ *if the maps* $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) : \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ *are bijective for any* i. ∎

Assume that λ is generic. Let P be a point of $X - D$. Then we have the endomorphisms M_i^{λ} on $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|P}$. Here M_i^{λ} is the monodromy with respect to D_i. We have $\mathcal{S}p(M_i^{\lambda}) = \mathcal{S}p^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$. We put $\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda} = (M_1^{\lambda}, \ldots, M_l^{\lambda})$. We have the decomposition for each P:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|P} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\omega}).$$

Thus we obtain the decomposition $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$. It is compatible with the flat connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\, f}$. We put $q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \omega_i$. We put $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, 0, i) := \big\{u \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \,\big|\, -1 < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) \leq 0\big\}$. Then we have the unique element $u_i = u_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, 0, i)$ such that $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda, u_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})) = \omega_i$. Then we obtain the number $b_i = b_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}))$. We put $\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := (b_1, \ldots, b_l)$.

For $s \in \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)$, we put as follows (see the page 134 for $\alpha(b, \omega)$):

$$F\big(s, \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega})\big) := \exp\Big(\sum \log z_i \cdot \big(\alpha(b_i, \omega_i) + N_{i\,\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)\Big) \cdot s.$$

Note that we have the equality $-\operatorname{ord}(s_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}) = b_i$ for any point $P \in D_i^{\circ}$.

Lemma 8.12 *We have the following, for some positive constants C and M:*

$$|F(s,\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}))|_h \leq C\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i)}\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Bigr)^M$$

Proof For each $P\in D_i^{\circ}$, we have the equality $-\mathrm{ord}\bigl(F(s,\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}))_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i)$ (Lemma 7.64). Then we obtain the result due to Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 8.2. ▮

Corollary 8.3 *$F(s,\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}))$ are sections of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.* ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_j)$ be a base of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}$. We put $\boldsymbol{\omega}_j:=\mathbf{deg}^{\mathbb{E}}(s_j)$. We put $v_j:=F(s_j,\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j))$, and $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_j)$. It is a tuple of sections of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Lemma 8.13 *If λ is generic, the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is coherent and locally free, and $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.*

Proof For any point $P\in D_i^{\circ}$, the tuple $\boldsymbol{v}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)})$, due to Lemma 7.50. We put as follows:

$$c_i:=\sum_{a\in\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)}\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,a)\cdot a.$$

We have the line bundle ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ over X. We have the following on $\pi_i^{-1}(P)$:

$$\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr)_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}={}_{c_i}\bigl(\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)=\det\bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)\bigr).$$

We put $\Omega(\boldsymbol{v})=v_1\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r$. Then $\Omega(\boldsymbol{v})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ gives a frame of $\det\bigl({}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)\bigr)$. Hence $\Omega(\boldsymbol{v})$ is a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ over X.

Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. Then f is described as $\sum f_j\cdot v_j$ for holomorphic functions f_i on $X-D$. Let us consider $f\wedge v_2\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r$. On the curve $\pi_i^{-1}(P)$, it gives a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$. Hence $f\wedge v_2\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r$ is a holomorphic section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ over X. We have $f\wedge v_2\wedge\cdots\wedge v_r=f_1\cdot\Omega(\boldsymbol{v})$. Hence f_1 is holomorphic over X. Similarly f_j is holomorphic for each j. ▮

Remark 8.2 *The last argument can be found in* [11]. ▮

8.3.2 Weak norm estimate

In the case $s_j\in\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$, we put $u_i(v_j):=u_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})$. We put as follows:

$$v_j':=v_j\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))}.$$

We put $\boldsymbol{v}':=(v_j')$. Then there exist positive constants M and C satisfying the following, due to Lemma 8.12:

$$H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')\leq C\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Bigr)^M. \tag{189}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}=(v_j^{\vee})$ be the dual frame of $\boldsymbol{v}$ over $X-D$.

Lemma 8.14 *There exits positive constants C and M satisfying the following:*

$$|v_j^{\vee}|_h\leq C\cdot\prod_i|z_i|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))}\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Bigr)^M.$$

Proof We have the estimates for the restrictions $v^{\vee}_{j\,|\,\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ due to the result in the subsubsection 7.4.7. Then we can derive the estimate desired, due to Corollary 2.6. ∎

We put as follows:

$$v_j^{\vee\prime} := v_j^{\vee}\cdot\prod_i |z_i|^{-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))}.$$

We put $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\prime} := (v_j^{\vee\prime})$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\prime}$ is the dual frame of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ over $X-D$, and there exist positive constants C and M satisfying the following, due to Lemma 8.14:

$$H\big(h^{\vee},\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\prime}\big)\leq C\cdot\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Big)^{M}. \tag{190}$$

Hence we obtain the following.

Lemma 8.15 *The frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order. Namely, there exist positive constants C_1, C_2 and M satisfying the following:*

$$C_1\cdot\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Big)^{-M}\leq H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')\leq C_2\cdot\Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Big)^{M}.$$

Proof The right inequality is given in (189). The left inequality immediately follows from (190). ∎

8.3.3 Minor generalization and a restriction to a diagonal curve

Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. We put $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,\boldsymbol{c},i) := \big\{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)\,\big|\,c_i-1<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)\leq c_i\big\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ as in the subsubsection 8.3.1. We put ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j := F\big(s_j,\boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j)-\boldsymbol{c}\big)$, and we put ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v} := \big({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j\big)$.

Lemma 8.16 *If λ is generic, the sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is locally free, and ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}$ gives a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 8.13. ∎

In the case $s_j\in\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\big)$, $u_i({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j)$ denotes the unique element of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,\boldsymbol{c},i)$ such that $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,u_i({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j))=\omega_i$. We put as follows:

$${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j{}' := {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j))}.$$

We put ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}' = ({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_j{}')$.

Lemma 8.17 *The frame ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to Lemma 8.15. ∎

Lemma 8.18 *We have the following relation:*

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\,{}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v} = {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\sum_j\big(C_j+N_j\big)\cdot\frac{dz_j}{z_j}.$$

Here C_j denote the diagonal matrices whose (i,i)-components are $\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,u_j({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}v_i)\big)$, and N_j denote the nilpotent matrices.

Proof It follows from Lemma 7.64. ∎

Let ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, and we put $\boldsymbol{c} := (\overbrace{\epsilon,\ldots,\epsilon}^{l})$. and ϵ_i $(i=1,2)$ be positive numbers such that $\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2<1/2$. Assume the following:

- Let a be elements of $\mathcal{P}ar({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$. Then $0<\epsilon-a<\epsilon_i$.

Pick an element $({}^0z_3, \dots, {}^0z_n) \in (\Delta^*)^{n-2}$. Let us consider the curve $C_0 := \{(z, z, {}^0z_3, \dots, {}^0z_n) \in X\}$. We have the restriction of $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ to C_0.

Lemma 8.19

1. *We have the following implication:*

$$\mathcal{KMS}\bigl({}_{2\epsilon}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0}\bigr)\bigr) \subset \bigl\{u_1 + u_2 \,\big|\, u_i \in \ KMS\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i\bigr)\bigr\}.$$

2. *We have the following equality:*

$$\sum_{b \in \mathcal{P}ar\left({}_{2\epsilon}\left(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0}\right)\right)} b \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, b) = \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{b_i \in \mathcal{P}ar\left({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i\right)} b_i \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, b_i). \tag{191}$$

Proof Let us take the frame $\boldsymbol{w} := {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}$ as above. For each w_j, we have the elements $u_j(w_i) \in \mathcal{K}\bigl(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, \boldsymbol{c}, j\bigr)$.

Let us consider the restriction $\tilde{w}_j := w_{j\,|\,C_0}$. We put as follows:

$$\widetilde{w}'_j := \tilde{w}_j \cdot |z|^{\mathfrak{p}\left(\lambda, u_1(w_j) + u_2(w_j)\right)}, \quad \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}' := \bigl(\widetilde{w}'_j\bigr).$$

Then the C^{∞}-frame $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}'$ is adapted up to log order, due to Lemma 8.17. Thus $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}$ gives a frame of ${}_{2\epsilon}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0}\bigr)$. We also have the following relation, due to Lemma 8.18:

$$\mathbb{D}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}} \cdot \bigl(C_1 + C_2 + N_1 + N_2\bigr)\frac{dz}{z}. \tag{192}$$

Here C_i and N_j denote the matrices given in Lemma 8.18 for $\boldsymbol{w} = {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\boldsymbol{v}$. From the adaptedness of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}'$ up to log order and (192), we obtain the following:

$$\deg^{F,\mathbb{E}}\bigl(\widetilde{w}_j\bigr) = \mathfrak{k}\bigl(\lambda, u_1(v_j)\bigr) + \mathfrak{k}\bigl(\lambda, u_2(v_j)\bigr).$$

Thus we obtain the first claim.

We also obtain the following equality:

$$\sum_j -\operatorname{ord}\bigl(\widetilde{w}_j\bigr) = \sum_j \sum_{i=1,2} -{}^{i}\operatorname{ord}\bigl(v_j\bigr). \tag{193}$$

The left (resp. right) hand side of (193) are same as the left (resp. right) hand side of (191). Thus we obtain the second claim. ∎

8.4 Extension of holomorphic sections on a hyperplane

8.4.1 Preliminary I, Estimates of Higgs fields

We put $X = \Delta_{\zeta} \times \Delta_z^{n-1}$ and $X^{(0)} = \{0\} \times \Delta_z^{n-1}$. Let D'_i denote the divisor of Δ_z^{n-1} defined by $z_i = 0$. We put $D_i = \Delta_{\zeta} \times D'_i$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. We put $D_i^{(0)} = \{0\} \times D'_i$ and $D^{(0)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i^{(0)}$.

Let $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ be *generic*. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ as in the subsubsection 8.3.1. We put $\boldsymbol{b}(v_i) := \mathbf{deg}^F(v_i) \in]-1, 0]^l$. Let $b_h(v_j)$ denotes the h-th component of $\boldsymbol{b}(v_j)$. We put as follows:

$$v'_i := v_i \cdot \prod |z_h|^{b_h(v_i)}, \quad \boldsymbol{v}' = (v'_i).$$

We define the function $B : X - D \longrightarrow M(r)$ as follows:

$$B_{i\,j} := \begin{cases} \prod_{h=1}^{l} |z_h|^{b_h(v_i)}, & (i = j), \\ 0, & (i \neq j). \end{cases}$$

Then we have $\boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot B$.

We put $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}} = \overline{\partial}_E + \lambda_0 \cdot \theta^{\dagger}$, which is the holomorphic structure of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$. We define $K \in C^{\infty}\bigl(X - D, \Omega_X^{1,0} \otimes M(r)\bigr)$ by $K = B^{-1} \cdot \partial B = \partial B \cdot B^{-1}$. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 8.20 *We have the following formula:*

$$K_{i\,j} := \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{h=1}^{l} \frac{b_h(v_i)}{2} \frac{d\bar{z}_h}{\bar{z}_h}, & (i = j), \\ 0, & (i \neq j). \end{cases}$$

We have $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}} \boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot K$. ▮

The one forms $\Theta \in C^\infty\big(X - D, \Omega^{1,0} \otimes M(r)\big)$ and $\Theta^\dagger \in C^\infty\big(X - D, \Omega^{0,1}_X \otimes M(r)\big)$ are given as follows:

$$\theta \cdot \boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot \Theta, \qquad \theta^\dagger \cdot \boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot \Theta^\dagger.$$

The functions Θ^ζ, Θ^k, $\Theta^{\dagger\,\zeta}$ and $\Theta^{\dagger\,k}$ are defined as follows:

$$\Theta = \Theta^\zeta \cdot d\zeta + \sum_{k=1}^{l} \Theta^k \cdot \frac{dz_k}{z_k} + \sum_{k=l+1}^{n} \Theta^k \cdot dz_k,$$

$$\Theta^\dagger = \Theta^{\dagger\zeta} \cdot d\bar{\zeta} + \sum_{k=1}^{l} \Theta^{\dagger\,k} \cdot \frac{d\bar{z}_k}{\bar{z}_k} + \sum_{k=l+1}^{n} \Theta^{\dagger\,k} \cdot d\bar{z}_k.$$

Lemma 8.21 *The functions* Θ^ζ, Θ^k, $\Theta^{\dagger\,\zeta}$ *and* $\Theta^{\dagger\,k}$ *are dominated by polynomials of* $-\log|z_i|$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$.

Proof For the decompositions $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{l} f_i \cdot dz_i/z_i + \sum_{i=l+1}^{n} g_i \cdot dz_i$, the norms of f_i and g_j with respect to h are bounded (see the subsubsection 8.2.2). We also know that $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order (Lemma 8.15). Then the result follows. ▮

We have the λ_0-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0}$. Let A denote the λ_0-connection one form of $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e., A is a holomorphic section of $M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}_X(\log D)$ determined by the condition:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0} \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot A.$$

Due to our choice of $\boldsymbol{v}$, we have the decomposition $A = \bigoplus A_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ which corresponds the decomposition $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$, namely, A_ω is a holomorphic section of $\mathrm{End}\big(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, \boldsymbol{\omega})\big) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}(\log D)$.

Lemma 8.22 *A and B are commutative.*

Proof It follows from the decomposition $B = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} B(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot Id_{\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, \boldsymbol{\omega})}$ for $B(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \in C^\infty(X - D)$. ▮

We have the following formula:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0} \boldsymbol{v}' = \mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{v} \cdot B) = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot A \cdot B + \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \lambda_0 \partial(B) = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot (B^{-1}AB + \lambda_0 B^{-1} \partial B) = \boldsymbol{v}'(A + \lambda_0 \overline{K}). \tag{194}$$

We have the description:

$$A + \lambda_0 \cdot \overline{K} = \sum_{i=1}^{l} g_i \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i}.$$

Lemma 8.23 *The functions g_i are bounded.*

Proof Since A is a holomorphic section of $M(r) \otimes \Omega^{1,0}(\log D)$, the lemma follows from Lemma 8.20. ▮

Lemma 8.24 *We have the following equalities:*

$$\partial \Theta^\dagger + \Big[\lambda_0^{-1} \cdot (A + \overline{K} - \Theta), \Theta^\dagger\Big] = 0, \quad \overline{\partial} \Theta + \Big[K - \lambda_0 \Theta^\dagger, \Theta\Big] = 0. \tag{195}$$

Proof Recall the equalities $\partial_E(\theta^\dagger) = 0$ and $\partial_E = \lambda_0^{-1}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda_0} - \theta)$. We obtain the first equality in (195) from (194) and the definition of Θ.

As for the second equality in (195), we have only to use $\overline{\partial}_E(\theta) = 0$, $\overline{\partial}_E = \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}} - \lambda_0\theta^\dagger$ and $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}}\boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot K$. ▮

Lemma 8.25 *We regard $\Theta^\dagger(\zeta, z)$ and $\Theta(\zeta, z)$ as functions of ζ. Then the following holds:*

- *They are L_k^p for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and for any p.*
- *The L_k^p-norms of $\Theta^\dagger(\zeta, z)$ and $\Theta(\zeta, z)$ are dominated by polynomials of $(-\log|z_j|)$ $(j = 1, \ldots, l)$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 8.21, the formula (195), the estimate for A and K, and Corollary 2.10. ▮

Lemma 8.26 *We have the descriptions as follows:*

$$\partial_k \Theta^{\dagger\,\zeta} = C_k \cdot \frac{dz_k}{z_k} \cdot d\bar{\zeta}.$$

Here, C_k denotes an element of $C^\infty\big(X - D, M(r)\big)$. Their L^∞-norms are dominated by polynomials of $-\log|z_j|$ $(j = 1, \ldots, l)$.

Proof It follows from the estimates for Θ, A and K, due to Lemma 2.56. ▮

8.4.2 Preliminary II, Estimate of cocycles

Let λ be any element of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, and λ_0 be generic as in the subsubsection 8.4.1. Let f be a holomorphic section of the sheaf ${}^\diamond\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(0)} - D^{(0)}}\big)$ over X. Since the tuple of sections $\boldsymbol{v}'$ gives C^∞-frame of C^∞-bundle $\mathcal{E}^\lambda = \mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ over $X - D$, we have the following description:

$$f = \sum_i f_i(z) \cdot v_i'(0, z), \qquad f_i \in C^\infty(X^{(0)} - D^{(0)}).$$

Lemma 8.27 *Assume $-\mathbf{ord}(f) \leq 0$. Then there exist positive constants C and M satisfying the following:*

$$|f|_h \leq C \cdot \Big(-\sum_{i=1}^{l} \log|z_i|\Big)^M.$$

Proof We obtain such estimate for the restrictions $f_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ for any $P \in D_i^\circ$. Then we obtain the result due to Corollary 2.6. ▮

Due to the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ up to log order, we obtain the following inequalities for some positive constants C and M and for any $i = 1, \ldots, l$:

$$|f_i| \leq C \cdot \Big(-\sum_{j=1}^{l} \log|z_j|\Big)^M. \tag{196}$$

Note that we have the following relation:

$$\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda}\boldsymbol{v}' = \Big(\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}} + (\lambda - \lambda_0) \cdot \theta^\dagger\Big)\boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{v}' \cdot \Big(K + (\lambda - \lambda_0) \cdot \Theta^\dagger\Big). \tag{197}$$

Hence we obtain the following equality on $X^{(0)} - D^{(0)}$:

$$0 = \overline{\partial} f(z) = \sum_i \Big(\overline{\partial} f_i(z) + \sum_{k,j}\big(\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z) + \frac{b_k(v_i)}{2} \cdot \delta_{i\,j}\big) \cdot \bar{\eta}_k \cdot f_j\Big) \cdot v_i(0, z). \tag{198}$$

Here we put as follows:

$$\delta_{i\,j} := \begin{cases} 1 & (i = j) \\ 0 & (i \neq j) \end{cases} \qquad \bar{\eta}_k = \begin{cases} d\bar{z}_k/\bar{z}_k & (k \leq l) \\ d\bar{z}_k & (k \geq l + 1). \end{cases}$$

We have the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(-X_0)$. We put $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}(-X_0) := \mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{O}(-X_0)$.

Let ϵ be any sufficiently small positive number. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ denote the element $(\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{l})$.

Proposition 8.3 *There exists an element $\rho \in C^{\infty}(X - D, \mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ satisfying the following:*

1. *$\rho \in A^{0,0}_{-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ for any real number N.*
2. *$\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}\rho \in A^{0,1}_{-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}(-X_0))$ for any real number N.*
3. *$\rho_{|X^{(0)}-D^{(0)}} = f$.*
4. *The support of ρ is contained in the region $\bigl\{\zeta \,\big|\, |\zeta| < 1/3\bigr\} \times \bigl(X^{(0)} - D^{(0)}\bigr)$.*

See the subsubsection 2.7.4 *for the notation.*

Proof Let χ be any function over Δ_{ζ} satisfying the following:

$$\chi(\zeta) = \begin{cases} 1 & |\zeta| \leq 1/3 \\[2ex] 0 & |\zeta| > 2/3. \end{cases}$$

We put as follows:

$$f^1 := \sum_i f_i(z) \cdot v_i(\zeta, z), \qquad f^2 := \overline{\zeta} \cdot g^2, \qquad g^2 := \sum_{i,j} \Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z) \cdot f_j(z) \cdot v_i(\zeta, z).$$

We put $\rho := \chi \cdot (f_1 - f_2)$. Then the claims 3 and 4 are clear. Let us show the claims 1 and 2.

Lemma 8.28 *Let ϵ be a real number such that $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$, and N be any real number. Then we have $\rho \in L^2_{-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta},N}$.*

Proof It follows from (196) and Lemma 8.21. ▮

We have the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} f^1 &= \sum_i \Bigl(\overline{\partial} f_i + \sum_j \Bigl(\sum_k \bigl(\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) + \frac{b_k(v_i)}{2}\delta_{i\,j}\bigr) \cdot \bar{\eta}_k + \Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) \cdot d\bar{\zeta}\Bigr) \cdot f_j\Bigr) \cdot v_i(\zeta, z) \\ &= \sum_{i,k,j} \Bigl(\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) - \Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z)\Bigr) \cdot \bar{\eta}_k \cdot f_j \cdot v_i(\zeta, z) + \sum_{i,j} \Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) \cdot d\overline{\zeta} \cdot f_j \cdot v_i(\zeta, z). \end{aligned} \tag{199}$$

We also have the following:

$$\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}} f^2 = \sum_{i,j} \Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z) \cdot f_j(z) \cdot v_i(\zeta, z) \cdot d\bar{\zeta} + \bar{\zeta} \cdot \overline{\partial} g^2.$$

Hence we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}\bigl(\chi \cdot (f_1 - f_2)\bigr) = \overline{\partial}\chi \cdot (f_1 - f_2) + \chi \cdot \overline{\partial}(f_1 - f_2) = \overline{\partial}\chi \cdot (f_1 - f_2) \\ &+ \chi \times \Bigl(\sum_{i,k,j} \bigl(\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) - \Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z)\bigr) \cdot \bar{\eta}_k \cdot f_j \cdot v_i(\zeta, z) + \sum_{i\,j} \bigl(\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta, z) - \Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0, z)\bigr) \cdot f_j(z) \cdot v_i(\zeta, z) \cdot d\bar{\zeta} + \bar{\zeta} \cdot \overline{\partial} g^2\Bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{200}$$

Lemma 8.29 *$\overline{\partial}\chi \cdot (f^1 - f^2)$ is L^2-section of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}(-X_0) \otimes \Omega^{0,1}$.*

Proof Note that $\overline{\partial}\chi$ vanishes on $|\zeta| < 1/3$. Then the claim follows from Lemma 8.21 and Lemma 8.27. ▮

Lemma 8.30 *The following is L^2-section of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes(-X_0)\otimes\Omega^{0,1}$:*

$$\chi\times\Big(\sum_{i,k,j}\big(\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta,z)-\Theta^{k\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\big)\cdot\bar{\eta}_k\cdot f_j\cdot v_i(\zeta,z)+\sum_{i\,j}\big(\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta,z)-\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\big)\cdot f_j(z)\cdot v_i(\zeta,z)\cdot d\bar{\zeta}\Big)$$

Proof We put $K_0=\big\{\zeta\,\big|\,|\zeta|<2/3\big\}$. On $K_0\times(X_0-D_0)$, we have the following for $a=1,\ldots,n-1$, or ζ:

$$\Big|\Theta^{a\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\zeta,z)-\Theta^{a\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\Big|\leq|\zeta|\times\big|\big|\Theta^{a\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\cdot,z)\big|\big|_{C^1(K_0\times\{z\})}.$$

Here $\big|\big|\Theta^{a\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(\cdot,z)\big|\big|_{C^1(K_0\times\{z\})}$ denotes the C^1-norm of the restriction of $\Theta^{a\,\dagger}_{i\,j}$ to $K_0\times\{z\}$. Then we obtain the result from Lemma 8.25. ▮

Lemma 8.31 $\chi\cdot\bar{\zeta}\cdot\overline{\partial}g^2$ *is L^2-section of $\mathcal{E}(-X_0)\times\Omega^{0,1}$.*

Proof We have the following:

$$\chi\cdot\bar{\zeta}\cdot\overline{\partial}g^2=\chi\cdot\bar{\zeta}\cdot(\lambda-\lambda_0)\times \sum_{i\,j}\Big(\overline{\partial}\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\cdot f_j(z)\cdot v_i'(\zeta,z)+\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\overline{\partial}f_j(z)\cdot v_i(\zeta,z)+\Theta^{\zeta\,\dagger}_{i\,j}(0,z)\cdot f_j(z)\cdot\overline{\partial}v_i(\zeta,z)\Big).\quad(201)$$

The first summand can be dominated due to Lemma 8.26. The second summand can be dominated due to (198). The third summand can be dominated due to (197). ▮

Hence the claims 2 and 1 are obtained, and the proof of Proposition 8.3 is accomplished. ▮

8.4.3 Extension of holomorphic sections

We put $X=\Delta^n$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}D_i$. We put as follows:

$$X^{(1)}:=\big\{(z_1,\ldots,z_n)\in X\,\big|\,z_1=z_2\big\},\quad D^{(1)}:=X^{(1)}\cap D,\quad X_0:=\big\{(z_1,\ldots,z_n)\in X\,\big|\,z_1=z_2=0\big\}.$$

Condition 8.2 *Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X-D$. Let ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 be positive numbers such that $\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2<1$. Assume that $\mathcal{KMS}\big({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i\big)$ is ϵ_i-small $(i=1,2)$.* ▮

We will show the following in the subsubsection 8.4.4.

Proposition 8.4 *Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle satisfying Condition 8.2. Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}_{X^{(1)}-D^{(1)}})$ on $X^{(1)}$. Then there exists a neighbourhood of X_0 in X, and there exists a holomorphic section $\tilde{f}\in\Gamma(U,{}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$, such that $\tilde{f}_{X^{(1)}\cap U}=f_{|X^{(1)}\cap U}$.*

Let $\varphi:\widetilde{\Delta}^2_z\longrightarrow\Delta^2$ be a blow up. We put $\widetilde{X}:=\widetilde{\Delta}^2_z\times\Delta^{n-2}_w$. Let ψ denote the composite of the following morphisms:

$$\widetilde{X}\overset{\varphi\times id}{\longrightarrow}\Delta^2_z\times\Delta^{n-2}_w\longrightarrow\Delta^n_z.$$

Here the second morphism is given by $z_i=z_i$ $(i=1,2)$ and $w_i=z_{i-2}$ $(i=3,\ldots,n)$. We put as follows:

$$\widetilde{D}:=\psi^{-1}(D)=\Big[\big(\varphi^{-1}(0,0)\cup\widetilde{D}_1'\cup\widetilde{D}_2'\big)\times\Delta^{n-2}_w\Big]\cup\Big[\Delta^2_z\times\Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-2}\{w_i=0\}\Big)\Big].$$

Then the restriction of ψ to $\widetilde{X}-\widetilde{D}$ gives the isomorphism of $\widetilde{X}-\widetilde{D}$ and $X-D$.

We denote the closure of $\psi^{-1}(X^{(1)}-D^{(1)})$ by $\widetilde{X}^{(1)}$. We put $\widetilde{D}^{(1)}:=\psi^{-1}(D)\cap\widetilde{X}^{(1)}$. We put $\widetilde{X}_0=\psi^{-1}(X_0)$. The restriction of ψ to $\widetilde{X}^{(1)}$ gives an isomorphism of $\widetilde{X}^{(1)}$ and $X^{(1)}$.

Lemma 8.32 *Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\psi^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $\widetilde{X}^{(1)}$. Then there exists a neighbourhood $\widetilde{U}$ of $\widetilde{X}_0$ in $\widetilde{X}$, and there exists a holomorphic section $\tilde{f}\in\Gamma(\widetilde{U},{}^{\diamond}\psi^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, such that $\tilde{f}_{|\tilde{X}^{(1)}\cap\tilde{U}}=f_{|\tilde{X}^{(1)}\cap\tilde{U}}$.*

It is easy to see that Lemma 8.32 implies Proposition 8.4.

8.4.4 Proof

We essentially use the argument in the subsubsection 4.7.4 in [38]. To apply Corollary 2.7, recall the setting of the subsubsections 2.7.7–2.7.9. Let consider the blow up $\widetilde{\Delta_z^2} \longrightarrow \Delta_z^2 = \{(z_1, z_2)\}$ at $O = (0,0)$ as in the subsubsection 8.4.3. We can take a holomorphic embedding ι of Y, given in the previous subsubsection, to $\widetilde{\Delta}^2$ satisfying the following:

- The image of the 0-section $\mathbb{P}^1$ is the exceptional divisor $\phi^{-1}(O)$.
- We have $\iota^{-1}(D_1') = \pi^{-1}(\infty)$ and $\iota^{-1}(D_2') = \pi^{-1}(0)$.

We may assume that $\pi^{-1}(P) = \iota^{-1}\big(\widetilde{C}(1,1)\big)$ for $P = [1:1] \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

We put $\overline{X} := Y \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$. Then we have the naturally induced morphism $\overline{X} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\Delta_z^2} \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$, which we also denote by ι. We put as follows:

$$\overline{D} := \iota^{-1}(\widetilde{D}), \quad \overline{X^{(1)}} := \iota^{-1}(\widetilde{X^{(1)}}) = \pi^{-1}(P) \times \Delta_w^{n-2}, \quad \overline{D^{(1)}} := \overline{X^{(1)}} \cap \overline{D}.$$

Note that $\iota(\overline{X})$ gives a neighborhood of $\widetilde{X_0}$ in $\widetilde{X}$. The composite $\psi \circ \iota$ is denoted by ψ_1.

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$ satisfying Condition 8.2. Recall that the holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ with the hermitian metric h is acceptable (Corollary 8.2). We take the numbers ϵ, a and b be as in Lemma 2.36, and we take the metric $\tilde{h}$ of $\psi_1^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ as in (22).

Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X_0 - D_0})$, or equivalently, ${}^\diamond\psi^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\widetilde{X}_0 - \widetilde{D}_0}$. Clearly Lemma 8.32 can be reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 8.33 *There exists a holomorphic section* $\tilde{f}$ *of* ${}^\diamond\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ *over* $\overline{X^{(1)}}$ *such that* $\tilde{f}_{|\overline{X}^{(1)}} = f_{|\overline{X}^{(1)}}$.

Proof Take an embedding $\kappa : \Delta_\zeta \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^1 - \{0, \infty\}$ such that $\kappa(0) = P$. By using Proposition 8.3, we can take a C^∞-function ρ whose support is contained in $\pi^{-1}(\kappa(\Delta_\zeta)) \times \Delta_w^{n-2}$, and satisfying the following:

- ρ is an element of $A^{0,0}_{\tilde{h}}\big(\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$.
- $\overline{\partial}_E(\rho)$ is an element of $A^{0,1}_{\tilde{h}}\big(\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda(-\overline{X^{(1)}})\big)$.
- We have $\rho_{|\overline{X}^{(1)} - \overline{D}^{(1)}} = f$.

Here $\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^0(-\overline{X^{(1)}})$ is same as $\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$.

Due to Corollary 2.7, we can pick an element G of $A^{0,0}_{\tilde{h}}\big(\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^0(-\overline{X^{(1)}})\big)$ such that $\overline{\partial} G = \overline{\partial}\rho$. Then we put $\tilde{f} := \rho - G$. Then it satisfies $\overline{\partial}\tilde{f} = 0$, $\tilde{f} \in A^{0,0}_{\tilde{h}}(\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^0)$, and $\tilde{f}_{|\overline{X}^{(1)} - \overline{D}^{(1)}} = f_{|\overline{X}^{(1)} - \overline{D}^{(1)}}$.

Let us check that $\tilde{f}$ gives a section of ${}^\diamond\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. We regard $\tilde{f}$ as a section of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over an open subset $\psi_1(\overline{X} - \overline{D})$ of $X - D$. We have only to check that $\tilde{f}$ gives a section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over $\psi_1(\overline{X})$. To show it, let us consider the norm of $\tilde{f}$ with respect to our original metric h. We consider the restriction of $\tilde{f}$ to $\pi_j^{-1}(P)$, for any point $P \in D_j^\circ$ and for $1 \leq j \leq l$. First we consider the case $j = 1$. On the curve $\pi_1^{-1}(P)$, the metric $\tilde{h}$ is equivalent to $h \cdot |z_1|^{a-\epsilon} \times Q$, where Q denotes a polynomial of $\log|z_1|$. Thus we obtain $-\operatorname{ord}\big(\tilde{f}_{|\pi_1^{-1}(P)}\big) \leq -a + \epsilon < 1 - \epsilon_1$, due to our choice of ϵ, a, b (Lemma 2.36). Since $\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, 1)$ is ϵ_1-small (Condition 8.2), the intersection of the sets $\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^0, 1)$ and $\big\{c \,\big|\, 0 \leq c < 1 - \epsilon_1\big\}$ is empty. Therefore we can conclude that $-\operatorname{ord}\big(\tilde{f}_{|\pi_1^{-1}(P)}\big) \leq 0$ with respect to the original metric h. Similarly we can show that $-\operatorname{ord}\big(\tilde{f}_{|\pi_2^{-1}(P)}\big) \leq 0$ for any point $P \in D_2^\circ$. If $j > 2$, then the metrics h and $\tilde{h}$ are equivalent on the curve $\pi_j^{-1}(P)$. Thus we obtain $-\operatorname{ord}\big(\tilde{f}_{|\pi_2^{-1}(P)}\big) \leq 0$ with respect to the metric h, also in this case. Thus we obtain that $\tilde{f}$ is, in fact, a section of ${}^\diamond\psi_1^*\mathcal{E}^0$, due to Corollary 2.6. ▮

8.4.5 Extension property in the codimension one case

We put $X := \Delta_z^n \times \Delta_w$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. We put $X^{(2)} := \Delta_z^n \times \{0\}$ and $D^{(2)} = D \cap X^{(2)}$. We have the origin $(O,0) \in X^{(2)} \subset X$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be any tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let us consider the restriction of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ to $X^{(2)} - D^{(2)}$.

Lemma 8.34 *Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(2)}-D^{(2)}}\bigr)$ defined on a neighbourhood of $(O,0)$ in $X^{(2)}$. Then there exists a holomorphic section $\tilde{f}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ defined on a neighbourhood of $(O,0)$, which satisfies $\tilde{f}_{|X^{(2)}} = f$.*

Proof The argument is essentially same as the proof of Lemma 8.33. In fact, we can show the claim more simply, by using the results in the subsubsections 8.4.1–8.4.2 and the vanishing in Lemma 2.30. ∎

8.4.6 Local freeness in codimension one

We put $X = \Delta \times \Delta_w^n$, $D = \{0\} \times \Delta_w^n$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be any tame harmonic bundle on $X - D$. Let π denote the projection of X to D. Let P be a point of D. Then we obtain the smooth curve $\pi^{-1}(P)$.

Corollary 8.4 *Let b be any real number. Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_b\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}\bigr)$ defined on a neighbourhood of $(0,P)$ in $\pi^{-1}(P)$. Then there exists a holomorphic section $\tilde{f}$ of ${}_b\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ defined on a neighbourhood of $(0,P)$ in X, such that $\tilde{f}_{|\pi^{-1}(P)} = f$.*

Proof We have only to use Lemma 8.34 inductively. ∎

The following corollary will be used without mention.

Corollary 8.5 *The sheaf ${}_b\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is locally free. The restriction ${}_b\mathcal{E}^\lambda \longrightarrow {}_b\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$ is surjective.*

Proof The second claim is shown in Corollary 8.4. Let us show the first claim. We have only to prove the case $b = 0$. We have the set $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, 1)$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$, which is compatible with the parabolic filtration F. For each v_i, we have the number $b_i := \deg^F(v_i)$.

Then we can pick sections $\tilde{v}_i$ of ${}_{b_i}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ such that $\tilde{v}_{i\,|\,\pi_i^{-1}(P)} = v_i$, by using Corollary 8.4. Thus we obtain the tuple $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := (\tilde{v}_i)$ of sections of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. We would like to show that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.

We put $\tilde{b} := \sum_{b\in\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^\lambda,1)} \mathfrak{m}(\lambda,b)\cdot b$. Then we have the natural isomorphism ${}_{\tilde{b}}\bigl(\det\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)_{|\pi^{-1}(P)} \simeq \det\bigl({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}\bigr)$. Let us consider the section $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}) := \tilde{v}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \tilde{v}_{\mathrm{rank}\, E}$. Since $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$, we have $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|(0,P)} \neq 0$. Hence $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})$ gives a frame of ${}_{\tilde{b}}\bigl(\det\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$ around $(0,P)$. Then we can conclude that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ on a neighbourhood of $(0,P)$, due to the last argument in the proof of Lemma 8.13. ∎

8.5 Preliminary prolongation of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ (Special case)

8.5.1 Preliminary

Assume that $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)$ are ϵ_i-small and $\sum_i \epsilon_i < 1$. Pick an element $({}^0z_3, \ldots, {}^0z_n) \in (\Delta^*)^{n-2}$. Let us consider the curve $C_0 := \{(z, z, {}^0z_3, \ldots, {}^0z_n) \in X\}$. We have the restriction of $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ to C_0.

Lemma 8.35 *We have the following claims for the KMS-structure of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|C_0}$.*

- *$\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|C_0})$ is $(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)$-small.*
- *We have the following equality:*

$$\sum_{b\in\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|C_0})} b \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, b) = \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{b_i\in\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)} b_i \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, b_i).$$

Proof If $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, we have the following:

$$\mathcal{P}ar({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i) = \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i), \qquad \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i) = \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i).$$

We use the following lemma.

Lemma 8.36 *If η is sufficiently small, the set $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}, i)$ depends on $\lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda, \eta)$ continuously.*

Proof We put as follows: $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}^0, \lambda, 0, i) := \bigl\{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \bigm| \mathfrak{k}(\lambda, u) \in \mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda)\bigr\}$. Then we have the following

$$\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}, i) = \bigl\{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda', u) \bigm| u \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}^0, \lambda, 0, i)\bigr\}.$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Let $\lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda, \eta)$ be generic. Due to Lemma 8.19, the following holds:

$$\mathcal{KMS}\bigl({}_{2\epsilon}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}_{|C_0})\bigr) \subset \bigl\{u_1 + u_2 \bigm| u_i \in \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}, i)\bigr\}$$

Then the following holds for any $\lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda, \eta)$:

$$\mathcal{KMS}\bigl({}_{2\epsilon}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}_{|C_0})\bigr) \subset \bigl\{u_1 + u_2 \bigm| u_i \in \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}, i)\bigr\}, \quad \mathcal{P}ar\bigl({}_{2\epsilon}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}_{|C_0})\bigr) \subset \bigl\{a_1 + a_2 \bigm| a_i \in \mathcal{P}ar({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda'}, i)\bigr\}.$$

In particular, we obtain the following:

$$\mathcal{P}ar\bigl({}_{2\epsilon}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0})\bigr) \subset \bigl\{a_1 + a_2 \bigm| a_i \in \mathcal{P}ar({}_{\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)\bigr\} = \bigl\{a_1 + a_2 \bigm| a_i \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)\bigr\}.$$

Hence we obtain the first claim. We can show the second claim similarly by using Lemma 8.19. ▮

8.5.2 Preliminary prolongation

Lemma 8.37 *Let $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_l$ be positive numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^{l} \epsilon_i < 1$. Assume that $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)$ is ϵ_i-small. Then the $\mathcal{O}_X$-sheaf ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is locally free.*

Proof We use an induction on the dimension of X. As the hypothesis of the induction, we assume the following:

> The $\mathcal{O}_X$-sheaf ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is locally free, if the following holds:
>
> - $\dim(X) \leq n - 1$.
> - $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)$ is ϵ_i-small.
> - $\sum \epsilon_i < 1$.

We use the notation in the subsubsection 8.4.3. Due to the hypothesis of the induction and the first claim of Lemma 8.35, we have the local freeness of ${}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}-D^{(1)}})$. Pick a frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ of ${}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}-D^{(1)}})$ over $X^{(1)}$. For each v_i, we pick a section $\tilde{v}_i$ of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ over a neighbourhood U of X_0 such that $\tilde{v}_{i\,|\,U\cap X^{(1)}} = v_{i\,|\,U\cap X^{(1)}}$. We may assume that v_i are defined over X. Clearly Lemma 8.37 can be reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 8.38 *$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ around X_0.*

Proof We put as follows:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}} := (\tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_l), \quad \tilde{b}_i := \sum_{b \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i)} b \cdot \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, b).$$

The restriction $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ gives a tuple of holomorphic sections of ${}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)})$ for any $P \in D_i^\circ$. Hence $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ is a holomorphic section of $\det\bigl({}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)})\bigr) = {}_{\tilde{b}_i}\bigl(\det(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)$. It implies $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})$ is a holomorphic section of ${}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}}\det(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

We have the natural isomorphism $({}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}}\det(\mathcal{E}^\lambda))_{|X^{(1)}} \simeq \det\bigl({}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}})\bigr)$. Since $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|X^{(1)}}$ gives a frame of $\det\bigl({}^\diamond(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}})\bigr)$, we obtain $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|O} \neq 0$. It is standard argument to conclude that $\boldsymbol{v}$ gives a frame around the origin O. (See the proof of Lemma 8.13). Hence we obtain Lemma 8.38, and thus Lemma 8.37. ▮

8.6 Prolongation of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ and the compatibility of the parabolic filtrations

8.6.1 Statements of the theorems

In this subsection, we will show the following theorems.

Theorem 8.1 *For any $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}$, the $\mathcal{O}_X$-module ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ are coherent and locally free. In particular, ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ is locally free.*

Let us pick an element $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_1,\ldots,b_l)\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$ denote the element $(\overbrace{0,\ldots,0}^{i-1},1,0,\ldots,0)$. For any $\boldsymbol{b}'\leq\boldsymbol{b}$, we have the naturally defined morphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\longrightarrow{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. For $b_i-1\leq b\leq b_i$, we put $\boldsymbol{b}'=\boldsymbol{b}+(b-b_i)\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$ and as follows:

$$
{}^{i}F_b\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big):=\operatorname{Im}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}\longrightarrow{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}\big).
$$

Then we obtain the filtration ${}^{i}F({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}):=\big\{{}^{i}F_b({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\,\big|\,b_i-1\leq b\leq b_i\big\}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{D_i}$-modules.

Theorem 8.2

- *${}^{i}F({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ is a filtration in the category of vector bundles on D_i.*
- *The tuple of the filtrations $\big({}^{i}F\,\big|\,i=1,\ldots,l\big)$ on the divisors are compatible. (Definition 4.17).*
- *Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ be an element of $\prod_{i\in I}[b_i-1,b_i]$. We put $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}:=\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\eta}-q_I(\boldsymbol{b})$. Then we have the following:*

$$
{}^{I}F_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big):=\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}F_{\eta_i\,|\,D_I}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big)=\operatorname{Im}({}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_I}\longrightarrow{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_I}).
$$

Before entering the proof, we remark the following.

Lemma 8.39 *We have only to show the local freeness of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ for any tame harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)$ to prove Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 8.2.*

Proof For a tame harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)$, and $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}$, we have the harmonic bundle $(E',\overline{\partial}_{E'},h',\theta')=(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)\otimes L(-\boldsymbol{b})$. We denote the deformed holomorphic bundle of $(E',\overline{\partial}_{E'},h',\theta')$ by $\mathcal{E}'^{\lambda}$. Then we have the natural isomorphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\simeq{}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}'^{\lambda}$ by definition. Thus we are done. ▮

We also remark that we use Corollary 8.5 without mention.

8.6.2 Step 1

Condition 8.3 *Let us take an element $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{l}$ as follows for any i:*

1. *c_i are sufficiently large with respect to $\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$.*
2. *There exists a number $b_i\in]-1,0]$ such that $\{-b_i+\kappa(c_i\cdot a_i)\,|\,a_i\in\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)\}\subset]-1,0]$ and that it is $(2l)^{-1}$-small. We may also assume that $b_i-(2l)^{-1}>-1$. We put $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_1,\ldots,b_l)$.*

We put $(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},h_1,\theta_1):=\big(\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)\big)\otimes L(-\boldsymbol{b})$. We denote the deformed holomorphic bundle of $(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},h_1,\theta_1)$ by $\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}$. Then we have the natural isomorphism ${}^{\diamond}\big(\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big)={}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big(\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\big)\simeq{}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}$. We also have the following:

$$
\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda},i)=\big\{-b_i+\kappa(c_i\cdot a_i)\,|\,a_i\in\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)\big\}. \tag{202}
$$

Lemma 8.40 *${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}$ is locally free.*

Proof Due to (202) and our choice of $\boldsymbol{c}$ (see 2 in Condition 8.3), the set $\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda},i)$ are $(2l)^{-1}$-small for any $i=1,\ldots,l$. Note that $l\times(2l)^{-1}<1$. Then we obtain the result by using the preliminary prolongation (Lemma 8.37). ▮

Corollary 8.6 *The sheaf* ${}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$ *is a locally free* $\mathcal{O}_X$*-module.* ■

We have the natural $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-action on $\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, which is prolonged to the action on ${}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$. In particular, we obtain the μ_{c_i}-action on ${}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)_{|D_i}$. Since the action of μ_{c_i} on D_i is trivial, we have the decomposition:

$$ {}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\,D_i} = \bigoplus_{c_i-1\leq h\leq 0} V_h. $$

Here the generator ω of μ_{c_i} acts as ω^h on V_h.

Let us pick a point P of D_i°. We have the following morphism due to our choice of $\boldsymbol{c}$ (1 in Condition 8.3) and the result in the subsubsection 7.2.4:

$$ \varphi : \big\{h \,\big|\, -c_i+1\leq h\leq 0,\ V_h\neq 0\big\} \longrightarrow \big\{\tilde{b} \,\big|\, -1<\tilde{b}\leq 0,\ \mathrm{Gr}^F_{\tilde{b}}\big({}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\,\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\big)\neq 0\big\}. $$

We consider the filtration ${}^iF'_b$ of ${}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)_{|\,D_i}$ in the category of vector bundles on D_i, given as follows:

$$ {}^iF'_b := \bigoplus_{\varphi(h)\leq b} V_h. $$

Due to the construction, it is easy to see that the filtrations $({}^iF' \,|\, i=1,\ldots,l)$ are compatible in the sense of Definition 4.17.

We consider the subsheaf ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)'$ of ${}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$, given as follows:

$$ {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)' = \mathrm{Ker}\Big(\pi : {}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big) \longrightarrow \frac{{}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)_{|D_i}}{{}^iF'_b}\Big). $$

Here π denotes the naturally defined morphism.

Lemma 8.41 *We have the following:*

$$ {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)' = {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda_1\big), \qquad {}^iF'_b = {}^iF_b $$

Proof Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$. It can be also regarded as a section of ${}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. Let P be a point of D_i°. We have the element $f(P)$ of ${}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|P} = {}^\diamond\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\big)_{|P}$. Due to Lemma 7.34, we obtain $f(P)\in {}^iF'_{b\,|\,P}$.

Let $\bar{f}$ denote the image of f via the projection π. Then $\bar{f}(P)=0$ for any $P\in D_i^\circ$. It implies $\bar{f}=0$ on D_i. Hence we obtain $f\in {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)'$.

On the other hand, pick a section $f\in {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)'$. Due to Lemma 7.34, we obtain the following inequality for any $P\in D_i^\circ$:

$$ -\mathrm{ord}\big(f_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\big)\leq b. $$

Then we obtain $f\in {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$ due to Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 8.2.

In all, we obtain ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big) = {}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)'$. It implies that ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\big(\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$ is locally free, and ${}^iF_b = {}^iF'_b$. ■

Lemma 8.42 *We have the following:*

$$ {}^IF_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \mathrm{Im}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|D_I} \longrightarrow {}^\diamond\psi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|D_I}\big). $$

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 8.41. ■

8.6.3 Step 2

Let f be a section of ${}^\diamond\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. Assume the following:

- $f(0)\neq 0$, and f is compatible with the filtration ${}^iF$ $(i=1,\dots,l)$, i.e., there exists a splitting of ${}^iF$ $(i=1,\dots,l)$ which is compatible with f.
- f is equivariant, i.e., $g^*(f)=\prod\omega_i^{h_i}\cdot f$ for some $-c_i+1\leq h\leq 0$. Here $g=(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n)\in\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$.

We put $f_1:=\prod z_i^{-h_i}\cdot f\otimes e$. Then it is a section of $\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, and it is $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-invariant, i.e., $g^*(f_1)=f_1$ for any $g\in\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$. Hence there exists the unique section $\bar f$ of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ on $X-D$, such that $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\bar f=f_{1\,|\,X-D}$. Note the following:

$$-{}^i\operatorname{ord}(\bar f)=c_i^{-1}\bigl(h_i-{}^i\operatorname{ord}(f)\bigr)\leq 0.$$

Hence $\bar f$ gives the section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. If $f(O)\neq 0$, then $-{}^i\operatorname{ord}(f)>-1$, and thus $-{}^i\operatorname{ord}(\bar f)>-1$.

Let us take a frame $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$ of ${}^\diamond\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ satisfying the following conditions (Corollary 4.5):

- It is equivariant.
- It is compatible with the filtrations $({}^1F,\dots,{}^lF)$.

Then we obtain a tuple $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}=(\bar v_1,\dots,\bar v_r)$ of sections of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ by the procedure above.

Lemma 8.43 *${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is locally free, and $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a local frame on a neighbourhood of the origin O.*

Proof Recall that if $\dim(X)=1$ then we have already known the result (Lemma 7.36). Let us consider the element $\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}=(\tilde b_1,\dots,\tilde b_l)$ of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$, given as follows:

$$\tilde b_i:=\sum_{b\in\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda,i)}b\cdot\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,b).$$

Let P be a point of D_i°. Then $\Omega(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ is a frame of $\det\bigl({}^\diamond\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)\bigr)={}_{\tilde b_i}\det\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)$. Thus we obtain that $\Omega(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}})$ is a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\det(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

Let $f=\sum f_i\cdot\bar v_i$ be a holomorphic section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. As usual we can show that f_i are holomorphic over X, and thus $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. (see the proof of Lemma 8.13). In particular, the sheaf ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ is locally free. ∎

We consider the filtration ${}^iF'_b$ of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|D_i}$ in the category of the vector bundles over D_i, given as follows:

$${}^iF'_b:=\bigl\langle\bar v_{j\,|\,D_i}\bigm|-{}^i\operatorname{ord}(\bar v_j)\leq b\bigr\rangle$$

For any $-1<b\leq 0$, we consider the subsheaf ${}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\prime}$ of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ given as follows:

$${}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)':=\operatorname{Ker}\Bigl(\pi:{}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda\longrightarrow\frac{{}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|D_i}}{{}^iF'_b}\Bigr).$$

Here π denote the naturally defined morphism. Then ${}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)'$ is locally free.

Lemma 8.44 *We have ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^\lambda={}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)'$ and ${}^iF'_b={}^iF_b$.*

Proof We have already known that the claim holds if $\dim X=1$ (Lemma 7.36).

Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. We can also regard it as a section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. By applying Lemma 7.36 to $f_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\in{}^\diamond\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr)$, we obtain that $f(P)\in{}^iF'_{|P}$ for any $P\in D_i^\circ$. Then it is easy to derive that f is contained in ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)'$.

On the other hand, let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)'$. Applying Lemma 7.36 to $f_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$, we obtain $-\operatorname{ord}(f_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)})\leq b$. Then we obtain $f\in{}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ due to Corollary 2.6. Therefore we obtain ${}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^\lambda={}_{b\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\bigr)'$, and thus ${}^iF_b={}^iF'_b$. ∎

Lemma 8.45 *The filtration ${}^{i}F$ is a filtration in the category of the vector bundles over D_i. The filtrations $({}^{i}F\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l)$ are compatible.*

Proof By our construction, ${}^{i}F'$ is the filtration in the category of the vector bundles over D_i, and $({}^{i}F'\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l)$ are compatible. Then the lemma follows from Lemma 8.44. ▮

Lemma 8.46 *We have the following equality:*

$$^{I}F_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)=\mathrm{Im}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_I}\longrightarrow{}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_I}\bigr).$$

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 8.44. ▮

Then Theorem 8.1 follows from Lemma 8.43 and Lemma 8.39, and Theorem 8.2 follows from Lemma 8.45, Lemma 8.46 and Lemma 8.39. ▮

8.6.4 Weak norm estimate of holomorphic sections

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ compatible with the parabolic filtrations $({}^{i}F\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l)$. We obtain the numbers ${}^{i}b(v_j):={}^{i}\deg(v_j)$. We put as follows:

$$v_j':=v_j\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{{}^{i}b(v_j)},\qquad \boldsymbol{v}'=(v_j').$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is a C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $X-D$.

Proposition 8.5 *$\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order.*

Proof The argument is essentially same as the proof of Lemma 8.15. By our construction of $\boldsymbol{v}'$, the following is clear:

$$H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')\leq C_1\cdot\bigl(-\sum\log|z_i|\bigr)^{M}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}$ denote the dual frame of $\boldsymbol{v}$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}$ gives a tuple of sections of ${}_{-\boldsymbol{b}+(1-\epsilon)\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}$ for some $\epsilon>0$. Let P be a point of D_i°. Due to the result in the case of curves, $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ gives a frame of ${}_{-b_i+(1-\epsilon)}\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}{}_{|\pi^{-1}(P)}$, which is compatible with the parabolic filtration. We have ${}^{i}\deg^{F}(v_j^{\vee})=-{}^{i}b(v_j)$ on $\pi_i^{-1}(P)$ for any point $P\in D_i^{\circ}$. We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\,\prime}=(v_j^{\vee\,\prime}),\qquad v_j^{\vee\,\prime}:=v_j^{\vee}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{-{}^{i}b(v_j)}.$$

Due to Corollary 2.6, we obtain the following (see the subsubsection 8.3.2):

$$H(h^{\vee},\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\,\prime})\leq C_2\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Bigr)^{M}.$$

It implies the following:

$$C_3\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\Bigr)^{-M}\leq H(h,\boldsymbol{v}').$$

Thus we are done. ▮

8.7 Prolongation of $\mathcal{E}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times(X-D)}$

8.7.1 Preliminary

Recall that we may assume to have the following decomposition (Condition 8.1):

$$\mathcal{E}^0 = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{S}p(\theta)} E_{\boldsymbol{a}}.$$

Recall that there exists a positive constant ϵ_1 such that $E_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ and $E_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ are $\prod_{j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}|z_j|^{\epsilon_1}$-asymptotically orthogonal.

Let consider the λ-dependent section $g(\lambda)$ of $End(E)$ over $X-D$, given as follows:

$$g(\lambda) := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}} \exp\Bigl(\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{l}\bar{a}_i\cdot\log|z_i|^2\Bigr)\cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}. \tag{203}$$

Lemma 8.47 *We have the following equality:*

$$g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\overline{\partial}g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1} = -(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}}\Bigl(\sum_i \bar{a}_i\frac{d\bar{z}_i}{\bar{z}_i}\Bigr)\cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}. \tag{204}$$

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

We have the decomposition $\theta^{\dagger}=\phi_1+\phi_2+\phi_3$ satisfying the following:

- $\phi_1=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl(\sum_{i=1}^{l}\bar{a}_i\cdot\bar{z}_i^{-1}d\bar{z}_i\bigr)\cdot id_{E_{\boldsymbol{a}}}$.
- $\phi_2=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}}\phi_{2\,\boldsymbol{a}}$ where $\phi_{2\,\boldsymbol{a}}\in End(E_{\boldsymbol{a}})\otimes\Omega_X^{0,1}$, and $|\phi_{2\,\boldsymbol{a}}|_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ is bounded. Here $|\cdot|_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ denotes the norm with respect to h and the Poincaré metric.
- $\phi_3=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\neq\boldsymbol{b}}\phi_{3\,\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}$, where $\phi_{3\,\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}$ are sections of $Hom(E_{\boldsymbol{a}},E_{\boldsymbol{b}})\otimes\Omega_X^{0,1}$. We have the following estimate for some positive constants ϵ_2 and C:

$$\bigl|\phi_{3\,\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}\bigr|_{h,\mathbf{p}}\leq C\cdot\prod_{i\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}|z_i|^{\epsilon_2}.$$

The following lemma is clear

Lemma 8.48 *$g(\lambda)$ and ϕ_i ($i=1,2$) are commutative.* ∎

Lemma 8.49 *We have the following formula:*

$$\begin{aligned}&g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot(\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger})\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}=\\&\qquad\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda_0\cdot\theta^{\dagger}+(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\bigl(\phi_2+\phi_3\bigr)+\lambda\cdot\Bigl(g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\phi_3\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}-\phi_3\Bigr).\end{aligned} \tag{205}$$

Proof We have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot(\overline{\partial}+\lambda\theta^{\dagger})\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}&=\overline{\partial}_E+g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\overline{\partial}g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}+\lambda\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\theta^{\dagger}\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}\\&=\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda_0\cdot\theta^{\dagger}+g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\overline{\partial}g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}+(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\theta^{\dagger}+\lambda\cdot\Bigl(g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\theta^{\dagger}\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}-\theta^{\dagger}\Bigr).\end{aligned} \tag{206}$$

We obtain the following from (204):

$$g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\overline{\partial}g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}+(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\theta^{\dagger}=(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\bigl(\phi_2+\phi_3\bigr). \tag{207}$$

We also obtain the following from Lemma 8.48:

$$g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\theta^{\dagger}\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}-\theta^{\dagger}=g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\phi_3\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}-\phi_3. \tag{208}$$

Then we obtain (205) from (206), (207) and (208). ∎

Lemma 8.50 *We put $\psi(\lambda) := g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\phi_3\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}-\phi_3$. There exist positive constants η, ϵ' and C such that the following holds for any $\lambda,\lambda'\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta)$:*

$$\bigl|\bigl(\psi(\lambda)-\psi(\lambda')\bigr)_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}\bigr|_{h,\mathbf{p}}\leq C\cdot|\lambda-\lambda'|\cdot\prod_{i\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}|z_i|^{\epsilon'}.$$

Here $\bigl(A\bigr)_{\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}$ denotes the $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$-component of A, and $|\cdot|_{h,\mathbf{p}}$ denotes the norm with respect to h and the Poincare metric.

Proof By definition, the $(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})$-component of $\psi(\lambda)-\psi(\lambda')$ is as follows:

$$\phi_{3\,\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{2\lambda(a_i-b_i)}-\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{2\lambda'(a_i-b_i)}\Bigr).$$

Hence the norm is dominated by the following:

$$|\phi_{3\,\boldsymbol{a}\,\boldsymbol{b}}|_{h,\mathbf{p}}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{2\,\mathrm{Re}(\lambda'(a_i-b_i))}\cdot\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{2(\lambda-\lambda')(a_i-b_i)}-1\Bigr)\leq C\cdot\prod_{i\in\mathrm{Diff}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})}|z_i|^{\epsilon-\eta|a_i-b_i|}(-\log|z_i|)\cdot|\lambda-\lambda'|.$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We put as follows for any $\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$:

$$d''(\lambda):=g(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot(\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger})\cdot g(\lambda-\lambda_0)^{-1}. \tag{209}$$

Then we have the following equality due to (205):

$$d''(\lambda)=\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}+(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot(\phi_2+\phi_3)+\lambda\cdot\psi(\lambda).$$

It gives the holomorphic structure of C^∞-bundle E over $X-D$, and it is equivalent to $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^\lambda}=\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\cdot\theta^{\dagger}$ up to the (not unitary) gauge transformation.

Lemma 8.51 *If $\eta>0$ is sufficiently small, then there exists a positive constant C such that the following holds for any $\lambda,\lambda'\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta)$:*

$$|d''(\lambda)-d''(\lambda')|_{h,\mathbf{p}}\leq|\lambda-\lambda_0|\cdot C. \tag{210}$$

Note that $d''(\lambda)-d''(\lambda')$ are $(0,1)$-forms.

Proof We have the following:

$$d''(\lambda)-d''(\lambda')=(\lambda-\lambda')\cdot(\phi_2+\phi_3)+\lambda\cdot(\psi(\lambda)-\psi(\lambda')).$$

Thus we obtain the result from Lemma 8.50 and the estimates for ϕ_i $(i=2,3)$. ∎

Let p_λ denote the projection $\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta)\times(X-D)\longrightarrow X-D$, and then we have the C^∞-bundle $p_\lambda^{-1}E$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta)\times(X-D)$. We have the naturally defined operator:

$$\overline{\partial}_\lambda+d''(\lambda):C^\infty(p_\lambda^{-1}(E))\longrightarrow C^\infty\bigl(p_\lambda^{-1}(E)\otimes\Omega^{0,1}_{\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\eta)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\eta)}\bigr).$$

Lemma 8.52 *The operator $\overline{\partial}_\lambda+d''(\lambda)$ gives a holomorphic structure, i.e., $(\overline{\partial}_\lambda+d''(\lambda))^2=0$.*

Proof Note that $g(\lambda-\lambda_0)$ is holomorphic with respect to λ. Then the claim can be checked by a direct calculation. ∎

We use the notation in the subsubsection 2.7.4. We put as follows:

$$\bigl\langle f_1,f_2\bigr\rangle_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{a},N}:=\int\bigl(f_1,f_2\bigr)_{\boldsymbol{a},N}\,\mathrm{dvol}+\int\bigl(d''(\lambda)f_1,\ d''(\lambda)f_2\bigr)_{\boldsymbol{a},N}\,\mathrm{dvol},\qquad ||f||^2_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{a},N}:=\bigl\langle f,f\bigr\rangle_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{a},N}.$$

Lemma 8.53 *For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$, the norms $||\cdot||_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{a},N}$ and $||\cdot||_{\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{a},N}$ are equivalent.*

Proof It follows from the inequality (210) ∎

Hence the completions with respect to the norms $||\cdot||_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{a},N}$ are independent of a choice of $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ for some sufficiently small positive number η. Let $A^{0,q}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$ be the completion of the space $A^{0,q}_c(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$ with respect to the norm $||\cdot||_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$. Then we have the family of complexes $\big(A^{0,\cdot}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}), d''(\lambda)\big)$ $(\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta))$.

8.7.2 Extension of holomorphic sections

Lemma 8.54 *There exists a positive number $\eta > 0$ and the family of linear morphisms $G(\lambda) : \mathrm{Ker}(d''(\lambda_0)) \longrightarrow A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$ depending $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ satisfying the following:*

- *The vanishing $H^i(A^{0,\cdot}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}), d''(\lambda)) = 0$ holds for any $i > 0$ and for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*
- *The morphism $G(\lambda)$ satisfies the conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Lemma 2.39. It gives the trivialization of the family $\big\{\mathrm{Ker}\, d''(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)\big\}$, namely $G(\lambda)$ gives the homeomorphism of $\mathrm{Ker}\, d''(\lambda_0)$ and $\mathrm{Ker}\, d''(\lambda)$ for any point $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$.*

Proof Note that $d''(\lambda_0) = \overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}}$, and hence the conditions in Lemma 2.41 is satisfied due to Lemma 2.30. Then we obtain the result due to Lemma 2.41. ∎

Recall that we have the C^∞-bundle $p_\lambda^{-1}(E)$ with the hermitian metric $h_{\boldsymbol{a},N} = h \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{a_i} \cdot \big(-\log|z_i|\big)^N$. We have the holomorphic structure $\overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda)$ (Lemma 8.52).

Corollary 8.7 *For any section f of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}$, we have a holomorphic section $\tilde{f}$ of the holomorphic bundle $\big(p_\lambda^{-1}E, \overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda)\big)$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times (X - D)$ such that $\tilde{f}_{|\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)} \in A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$.*

Proof Let $G(\lambda)$ be the family of the morphism given in Lemma 8.54. We put $\tilde{f}_{|\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)} := G(\lambda)(f)$. We have the absolute convergent series in $A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$:

$$\tilde{f} = \sum (\lambda - \lambda_0)^i \cdot f_i, \qquad f_i \in A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}). \tag{211}$$

By our construction, it is clear that the restrictions $\tilde{f}_{\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)}$ are contained in $A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$. Since (211) is absolute convergent, we also have the following finiteness:

$$\int_{\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon)\times(X-D)} |\tilde{f}|_h^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l} |z_i|^{a_i} (-\log|z_i|)^N \,\mathrm{dvol} < \sum \frac{\pi}{h+1} \epsilon^{2(h+2)} ||f_i|| < \infty. \tag{212}$$

The finiteness (212) implies that $\tilde{f}$ can be regarded as L^2-section on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times (X - D)$ with respect to the metric $h_{\boldsymbol{a},N}$.

We have clearly $\overline{\partial}_\lambda \tilde{f} = 0$. We have $d''(\lambda)(\tilde{f}_{|\lambda}) = 0$ for any point $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$, by our construction. Then we obtain $d''(\lambda)(\tilde{f}) = 0$ in the distribution sense, due to Fubini's theorem. Hence we obtain $\big(\overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda)\big)\tilde{f} = 0$ in the distribution sense. Thus we can conclude that $\tilde{f}$ is holomorphic section with respect to $\overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda)$. ∎

We put $F(\lambda) := g(\lambda - \lambda_0)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{f}$. Then F gives a section of the C^∞-bundle $p_\lambda^{-1}(E)$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times X$.

Lemma 8.55 *For any positive number ϵ, there exists a positive number η satisfying the following:*

- *F is holomorphic with respect to the holomorphic structure $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}} = \overline{\partial}_\lambda + \overline{\partial}_E + \lambda \cdot \theta^\dagger$, i.e., F gives a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times (X - D)$.*
- *For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ and for any $\epsilon' > 0$ there exists a positive constant C satisfying the following inequality:*

$$\big|F_{\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)}\big|_h = C \cdot \Big(\prod |z_i|^{-a_i-\epsilon-\epsilon'}\Big).$$

Proof Since g is holomorphic with respect to λ, we have the following relation from (209):

$$\overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda) = g(\lambda - \lambda_0) \cdot \Bigl(\overline{\partial}_\lambda + \overline{\partial}_E + \lambda \cdot \theta^\dagger\Bigr) \cdot g(\lambda - \lambda)^{-1}.$$

Then the holomorphic property of F with respect to $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}}$ follows from the holomorphic property of $\tilde{f}$ with respect to $\overline{\partial}_\lambda + d''(\lambda)$.

For any positive number ϵ, there exist positive constants $\eta > 0$ and C_1 such that the following holds for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$:

$$\bigl|g(\lambda - \lambda_0)\bigr|_h \leq C_1 \cdot \Bigl(\prod |z_i|^{-\epsilon}\Bigr). \tag{213}$$

Since $\tilde{f}_{\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)}$ is an element of $A^{0,0}_{\boldsymbol{a},N}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$, we obtain the following finiteness for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ from (213):

$$\int_{\{\lambda\}\times(X-D)} |F(\lambda)|_h^2 \cdot \prod |z_i|^{a_i+\epsilon} \,\mathrm{dvol} < \infty$$

It implies the second claim. ▮

We formulate the result in this subsubsection.

Proposition 8.6 *Let $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. Assume that $b_i \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$. Then there exists a positive constant η satisfying the following:*

- *For any holomorphic section f of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$, there exists a holomorphic section F of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ such that $F_{|\{\lambda\}\times X} = f$.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 8.55. ▮

8.7.3 Prolongation of $\mathcal{E}$ around λ_0

Condition 8.4 *Let $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that $b_i \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ for any i.* ▮

Theorem 8.3 *Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ as in Condition 8.4. Then there exists a positive number η such that ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ is locally free over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times X$.*

Proof By considering the tensor product of $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ and the model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{u})$, we may assume that the residue of $\mathrm{tr}(\theta)$ is trivial. We can also assume that $\boldsymbol{b} = 0$. Note we have $0 \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ due to our assumption.

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$, compatible with ${}^iF$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$. We put ${}^ia_j := {}^i\deg(v_j)$. We have $-1 < {}^ia_j < 0$. We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_j := \bigl({}^1a_j, {}^2a_j, \ldots, {}^la_j\bigr), \qquad \boldsymbol{c} := \sum_j \boldsymbol{a}_j, \qquad {}^ic = \sum_j^{\mathrm{rank}\,E} {}^ia_j.$$

Then v_j is a holomorphic section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{a}_j}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$, and we have $\det({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}) = {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$.

By using Proposition 8.6, we can take $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, and holomorphic sections $\tilde{v}_j$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{a}_j+\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times X$ such that $\tilde{v}_{j\,|\,\{\lambda_0\}\times X} = v_j$. In particular, $\tilde{v}_j$ give holomorphic sections of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times X$. Hence we obtain the tuple of sections $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := (\tilde{v}_i)$ of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times X$.

Then we have the following inequality for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$:

$${}^i\deg(\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|\lambda}) < \sum_j {}^ia_j + r \cdot \epsilon < {}^ic + 1.$$

Hence $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|\{\lambda\}\times X}$ is a holomorphic section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) = {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E})_{|\{\lambda\}\times X}$. Since we have assumed that the residue of $\mathrm{tr}(\theta)$ is trivial, we have ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E})_{|\lambda} = \det({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. Since we have $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})_{|(\lambda_0,O)} \neq 0$, the section $\Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})$ gives a frame around (λ_0, O).

Then we can use the standard argument as follows (the last argument in the proof of Lemma 8.13). Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ on a neighbourhood U of (λ_0, O). On $\bigl(U \cap (X - D)\bigr) \times \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon)$, we have the following description:

$$f = \sum f_i \cdot \tilde{v}_i.$$

As usual, we consider the section $f \wedge \tilde{v}_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \tilde{v}_r = f_1 \cdot \Omega(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}})$ of $\det({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}) = {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\det(\mathcal{E})$ over U, and we can derive that f_1 is holomorphic. Similarly, we can show that f_i are holomorphic for any i. It implies that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ on a neighbourhood of (λ_0, O). $\blacksquare$

8.8 KMS-structure of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$

8.8.1 The parabolic structures ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E})$

Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ as in Condition 8.4. Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_j)$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ compatible with the parabolic structure. For each v_j, we obtain the element $\boldsymbol{a}(v_j) = (a_1(v_j), \ldots, a_l(v_j)) \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$, where we put $a_i(v_j) := {}^i\deg^F(v_j)$.

Let us pick a positive number ϵ as follows:

$$0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{3}\min\Bigl(\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}\bigl\{|a_1 - a_2| \bigm| a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i),\ a_1 \neq a_2\bigr\}\Bigr). \tag{214}$$

We can pick a positive number ϵ_0 such that there exist sections $\tilde{v}_j$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{a}(v_j)+\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, such that $\tilde{v}_{j|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}} = v_j$. If ϵ_0 is sufficiently small, we may assume the following:

Condition 8.5 *Let u_1, u_2 be elements of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_1) < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_2)$. Note we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_1) + \epsilon < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_2)$, due to* (214)*. Then the inequality $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_1) + \epsilon < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda', u_2)$ holds for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.*

On $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, the filtration ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$ is obtained as follows:

$${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}_a\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr) := \bigl\langle \tilde{v}_{j\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \bigm| {}^i\deg(v_j) \leq a' \bigr\rangle, \qquad a' := \max\bigl\{x \in \mathcal{P}ar({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}, i) \bigm| x \leq a\bigr\}.$$

For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta)$ and $c \in \mathcal{P}ar({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$, we put as follows:

$$d(\lambda, \lambda_0, c) := \max\bigl\{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) \bigm| u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i),\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) = c\bigr\}.$$

Recall that we have the parabolic filtration ${}^iF$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. So we compare the two vector subbundle ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}_{c\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times D_i}$ and ${}^iF_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^\lambda}$.

Lemma 8.56 *For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the equality ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}_{c\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times D_i} = {}^iF_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}$. In particular, the filtration ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$ is independent of choices of a compatible frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ and an extension $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$.*

Proof Since both of ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}_{c\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times D_i}$ and ${}^iF_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}$ are vector subbundles, we have only to show ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}_{c\,|\,(\lambda,P)} = {}^iF_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ for any $P \in D_i^\circ$. For that purpose, we have only to consider the restriction $\mathcal{E}$ to the curve $\pi_i^{-1}(P)$. Thus we can restrict our attention to the case $\dim(X) = 1$, which is assumed in the following of the proof.

In the case $\deg^F(v_i) = c$, we have the following inequality for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, due to Condition 8.5:

$$\deg^F\bigl(\tilde{v}_{i\,|\,\mathcal{X}^\lambda}\bigr) \leq c + \epsilon < \min\bigl\{d \in \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, i) \bigm| d > d(\lambda, \lambda_0, c)\bigr\}.$$

It implies $\tilde{v}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,O)}$ is contained in the space $F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}({}_b\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|O})$. Hence we obtain $F^{(\lambda_0)}_{c\,|\,(\lambda,O)} \subset F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}({}_b\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|O})$.

Due to our construction of the filtration $F^{(\lambda_0)}$, we have the following equality:

$$\operatorname{rank} F^{(\lambda_0)}_c = \sum_{b-1<c'\leq c} \mathfrak{m}(\lambda_0, c') = \sum_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0),\\ b-1<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\leq c}} \mathfrak{m}(0, u).$$

On the other hand, we have the following equality:

$$\operatorname{rank} F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}) = \sum_{b-1<c'\leq d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)} \mathfrak{m}(\lambda,c') = \sum_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0),\\ b-1<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)\leq d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}} \mathfrak{m}(0,u) = \sum_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0),\\ b-1<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\leq c}} \mathfrak{m}(0,u).$$

Note $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) > b-1$ if and only if $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u) > b-1$ due to our assumption $b \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$. Thus we obtain $F^{(\lambda_0)}_c({}_{b}\mathcal{E})_{|(\lambda,O)} = F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}({}_{b}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O})$. ∎

On $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we obtain the following vector bundle:

$${}^{i}\operatorname{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr) := \frac{{}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{c}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)}{{}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)}.$$

Corollary 8.8 *We have the following on $\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_i$ for any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta)$:*

$${}^{i}\operatorname{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}^{\lambda}_i} \simeq \frac{{}^{i}F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,c)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)}{\sum_{b<c}{}^{i}F_{d(\lambda,\lambda_0,b)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)}. \tag{215}$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 8.56. ∎

8.8.2 Regularity of $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$

Lemma 8.57 $\mathbb{D}$ *is the regular λ-connection, namely, if f is a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, then $\mathbb{D}f$ is a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_X(\log D)$.*

Proof Let us consider the case $\lambda_0\neq 0$. We may assume that any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is generic. In this case, the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|X^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ can be essentially regarded as a quasi canonical prolongment. Thus $\mathbb{D}f_{|X^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ gives a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}(\log\mathcal{D})_{|\mathcal{X}^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. Hence $\mathbb{D}f$ gives a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}(\log\mathcal{D})$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}^{\lambda_0}$. Note that the codimension of $\mathcal{D}^{\lambda_0}$ in $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is two. Thus $\mathbb{D}f$ gives a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}(\log\mathcal{D})$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Then we can show the claim in the case $\lambda=0$ by the same argument. ∎

Corollary 8.9 $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ *is the regular λ-connection.*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_1,\ldots,b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ and let f be a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. We may assume that $b_i\notin\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$ for any i. We can take a holomorphic section F of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda,\eta)\times X$ such that $F_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}=f$. Due to Lemma 8.57, $\mathbb{D}F$ is a section of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_X(\log D)$. Since we have $\mathbb{D}F_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}=\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}f$, we obtain the result. ∎

8.8.3 The residue and the λ-connection on the divisors

On $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we have ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. Then we have the endomorphisms $\operatorname{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$, which preserve the parabolic filtrations due to Lemma 8.57. We also have the induced λ-connection ${}^{i}\mathbb{D}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, which is defined as follows: For any $f\in{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, pick $F\in{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ such that $F_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=f$. Then we put ${}^{i}\mathbb{D}(f):=\mathbb{D}F_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$.

Lemma 8.58 *It is well defined.*

Proof Assume $F_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=0$. Then we have the description $F=z_i\cdot G$ for some $G\in{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$. We have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}(z_i\cdot G)=\lambda\cdot dz_i\cdot G+z_i\cdot\mathbb{D}G.$$

Thus $\pi(\mathbb{D}(z_i\cdot G)_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)})=0$, where π denotes the projection $\Omega_X(\log D)_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\longrightarrow\Omega_{D_i}(\log D\cap D_i)$. Hence we are done. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with the parabolic filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}F\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l\bigr)$. Then we obtain the λ-connection form $\mathcal{A}$ determined by $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\mathcal{A}$. We develop $\mathcal{A}$ as $\mathcal{A}=\sum\mathcal{A}^k\frac{dz_k}{z_k}$.

Lemma 8.59 *Then we have the following formula:*

$$\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})\boldsymbol{v}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \boldsymbol{v}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \cdot \mathcal{A}^i_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \qquad {}^i\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \boldsymbol{v}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \cdot \sum_{k\neq i} \mathcal{A}^k_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \frac{dz_k}{z_k}$$

Proof It immediately follows from the definitions. ■

Lemma 8.60 *${}^i\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ preserve the filtration ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$.*

Proof Let f be a section of ${}^iF_c^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\big)$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}'$ be the element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ as follows:

$$q_j(\boldsymbol{b}') = \begin{cases} b_j & (j \neq i) \\ c & (j = i). \end{cases}$$

Then by definition of the filtration $F^{(\lambda_0)}$, we can take a holomorphic section $F \in {}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\mathcal{E}$ such that $\pi(F_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}) = f$, where π denotes the natural morphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \longrightarrow {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. By definition, ${}^i\mathbb{D}(f)$ is the image of $\mathbb{D}F_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ via the morphism π', where π' denotes the tensor product of π and the identity morphism of $\Omega^{1,0}_{D_i}\big(\log(D\cap D_i)\big)$. Thus ${}^i\mathbb{D}$ preserves the filtration ${}^iF$. By a similar argument, we can show that $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ preserves the filtration ${}^iF$. ■

Corollary 8.10 *Assume ${}^k\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) < {}^k\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$. Then we have $\mathcal{A}^h_{i\,j\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} = 0$ for any h.* ■

Lemma 8.61 *The endomorphism $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ is flat with respect to ${}^i\mathbb{D}$.*

Proof It immediately follows from the flatness of $\mathbb{D}$. ■

8.8.4 The $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition

For $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, we put $\mathcal{T}(\lambda,c,i) := \big\{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)\,\big|\,\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u) = c\big\}$. Since $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^\lambda)$ preserves the parabolic filtration F of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|D_i}$, due to Lemma 8.60, we have the induced action of $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^\lambda)$ on ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

Lemma 8.62 *We have the generalized eigen decomposition of ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_c$ with respect to $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^\lambda)$ as follows:*

$${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda) = \bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{T}(\lambda,c,i)} \mathbb{E}\big({}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big).$$

The rank of $\mathbb{E}\big({}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)$ is $\mathfrak{m}(0,u)$.

Proof We have only to show $\mathrm{rank}\,\mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^F_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda)_{|P}, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big) = \mathfrak{m}(0,u)$ for any $P \in D_i^\circ$. It follows from the result in the case of curves (Corollary 7.16). ■

Let c and d be real numbers such that $d < c$. The residue $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D})$ induces the endomorphism of ${}^iF_c/{}^iF_d({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$.

Corollary 8.11 *The set of the eigenvalues of $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D})$ on ${}^iF_c/{}^iF_d({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$ is as follows:*

$$S = \Big\{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\,\Big|\,u \in \bigcup_{d<a\leq c} \mathcal{T}(\lambda,a,i)\Big\}.$$

The rank of the generalized eigenspace corresponding to $\beta \in S$ is given as follows:

$$\sum_{d<a\leq c}\ \sum_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{T}(\lambda,a,i)\\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)=\beta}} \mathfrak{m}(0,u).$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 8.62. ∎

Let us consider the generalized eigen decomposition of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}$ with respect to $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$. We put as follows for any point $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and for any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$:

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i) := \bigl\{ u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \bigm| b_i - 1 < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) \leq b_i \bigr\}.$$

Here b_i denotes the i-th component of $\boldsymbol{b}$.

Corollary 8.12 *The set of the eigenvalues of the endomorphism* $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ *on* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}$ *is given as follows:*

$$\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i) = \bigl\{ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) \bigm| u \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i) \bigr\}$$

The rank of the generalized eigenspace corresponding to $\beta \in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ *is given as follows:*

$$\mathfrak{m}(\lambda, \beta, i) := \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i) \\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) = \beta}} \mathfrak{m}(0, u).$$

Proof This is the special case of Corollary 8.11. ∎

Notation We put ${}^i\mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}, \beta\bigr)$, for simplicity. ∎

Let us pick any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. Then there exist small positive numbers η_2 and ϵ_2 such that we have the following decomposition into vector bundles on $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0, \eta_2)$, due to Corollary 8.12:

$${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0, \eta_2)} = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}), \beta\bigr).$$

Notation We put as follows: ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}, \beta\bigr) = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}), \beta\bigr)$, for simplicity. ∎

Lemma 8.63 *Assume* η_2 *and* ϵ_2 *are sufficiently small. Let* λ *be any element of* $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta_2)$. *Then we have the following decomposition:*

$${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}, \beta\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}} = \bigoplus_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i), \\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) = \beta}} {}^i\mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0, \eta_2)}, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\bigr).$$

Proof Since we have assumed $b_i \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$, we have $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i) = \mathcal{K}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{b}, i)$. If ϵ_2 is sufficiently small, $|\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) - \beta| < \epsilon_2$ implies $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) = \beta$. If η_2 is sufficiently small, we have $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) \neq \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u')$ for $u, u' \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{b}, i)$ such that $u \neq u'$. Thus we are done. ∎

Lemma 8.64 *The filtration* ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$ *and the decomposition* ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *are compatible.*

Proof Since $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ preserves the parabolic filtration ${}^iF$, the parabolic filtration ${}^iF$ and the decomposition ${}^iE$ are compatible. Then Lemma 8.64 follows from Lemma 8.63 and Lemma 8.56. ∎

Lemma 8.65 ${}^i\mathbb{D}$ *and* $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ *preserve* ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Proof As for $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$, it is clear. Since $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ is flat with respect to ${}^i\mathbb{D}$, the generalized eigen decomposition is preserved by ${}^i\mathbb{D}$. ∎

Let pick any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. Since $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ preserves the filtration ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$ due to Lemma 8.60, we have the induced action of $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ on ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_c^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E})$. Then there exist small positive numbers η_2 and ϵ_2 such that we have the following decomposition into vector bundles on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \eta_2) \times D_i$, due to Lemma 8.62:

$${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_c^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}) = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{T}(\lambda_0, c, i)} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}\bigl({}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_c^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}),\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u)\bigr).$$

Lemma 8.66 *Assume* ϵ_2 *and* η_2 *are sufficiently small. Let* λ *be any point of* $\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\eta_2)$ *and* P *be any point of* D_i*. The subspace* $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_2}\bigl({}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}),\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u)\bigr)_{|(\lambda,P)}$ *of* ${}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E})_{|(\lambda,P)}$ *is the generalized eigenspace of the induced endomorphism* $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ *corresponding to the eigenvalue* $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$*.*

Proof Since we have the isomorphism (215), the set of the eigenvalue of the induced morphism $\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ on ${}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_c({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E})_{|(\lambda,P)}$ is as follows, due to Corollary 8.11:

$$\bigl\{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\,\big|\,u\in\mathcal{T}(\lambda_0,c,i)\bigr\}.$$

Let u and u' be elements of $\mathcal{T}(\lambda_0,c,i)$. If η_2 is sufficiently small, $|\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u')|<\epsilon_2$ if and only if $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u')$. Since we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u')=c$, the condition $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u')$ implies $u=u'$. Hence the condition $|\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u')|<\epsilon_2$ implies $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)=\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u')$. we obtain the result. ■

Notation Let ${}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,u)}$ denote the space ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)},\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u)\bigr)$ for $u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$. ■

8.8.5 Weak norm estimate

Pick a frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. For each v_j and for each i, we have the unique element $u_i(v_j)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$ satisfying the following:

$${}^i\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}})=\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,u_i(v_j)).$$

Lemma 8.67 *Then* ${}^i\deg^{F^{(\lambda)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda)}}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}})=\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))$ *also holds for any* λ*.*

Proof We have the following for some sufficiently small positive number ϵ_3:

$$\max\Bigl\{\bigl|{}^i\deg^{F}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}})-{}^i\deg^{F}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}})\bigr|,\ \bigl|{}^i\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}})-{}^i\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_{j\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}})\bigr|\Bigr\}<\epsilon.$$

Since the unique element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$ satisfying such condition is $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))$, we are done. ■

Let us consider the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0,\eta_2)\times(X-D)$, given as follows:

$$v_j':=v_j\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i(v_j))},\qquad\boldsymbol{v}':=(v_j').$$

By a standard argument, we obtain the following.

Proposition 8.7 *The frame* $\boldsymbol{v}'$ *is adapted up to log order.*

Proof It is easy to see that $H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')\leq C\cdot\bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\bigr)^{M}$ for some positive constants M and C, which follows from Lemma 8.66. By considering the dual frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee\prime}$, we obtain $H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')\geq C'\cdot\bigl(-\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log|z_i|\bigr)^{-M'}$, as usual (See the proof of Proposition 8.5, for example). Thus we are done. ■

8.8.6 Some functoriality

Let consider the functoriality for tensor product. Let $(E^{(a)},\overline{\partial}_{E^{(a)}},h^{(a)},\theta^{(a)})$ $(a=1,2)$ be tame harmonic bundles. We obtain the deformed holomorphic bundles $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$. Let pick $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}$. For simplicity, we consider the following situation:

- $0\notin\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(a)\,\lambda},i)$ for $a=1,2$ and for $i=1,\ldots,l$.
- For any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, the sets $\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(a)\,\lambda},i)$ $(a=1,2)$ are $\eta_{a\,i}$-small such that $\eta_{1\,i}+\eta_{2\,i}<1$ for $i=1,\ldots,l$.

Take $\boldsymbol{v}^{(a)}$ be frames of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which are compatible with the filtration ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$.

Lemma 8.68 *$\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}\otimes\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\otimes\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\bigr)$, which is compatible with the filtration $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$*

Proof We obtain the frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{(a)\,\prime}$ from $\boldsymbol{v}^{(a)}$, which is adapted up to log order. Then $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)\,\prime}\otimes\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)\,\prime}$ is adapted up to log order, as in the subsubsection 8.8.5. Due to our assumption, we obtain that $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}\otimes\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$ gives a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{(1)}\otimes\mathcal{E}^{(2)}\bigr)$. Then the compatibilities with the filtration F and the decomposition $\mathbb{E}$ are clear. ∎

Corollary 8.13 *Let η be a positive number and R be positive integer such that $R\cdot\eta<1$. Assume the following for simplicity: For any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, the sets $\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$ are η-small.*

Then we have the following canonical isomorphism:

$$
{}^{\diamond}\bigwedge^{R}\mathcal{E}\simeq\bigwedge^{R}{}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E},\qquad {}^{\diamond}\mathrm{Sym}^{R}\,\mathcal{E}\simeq\mathrm{Sym}^{R}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}).
$$

∎

8.8.7 KMS-spectrum

Let I be a subset of I and $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{I}$. Due to the compatibility of the filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}\,\big|\,i\in I\bigr)$, we have the following vector bundles on $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:

$$
{}^{I}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}=\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{c_i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\qquad {}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}=\frac{{}^{I}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}'\lneq\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{I}F^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}}.
$$

On the vector bundle ${}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, we have the induced endomorphisms ${}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ $(i\in I)$. Hence we obtain the tuple of endomorphisms:

$$
{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D})):=\bigl({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}))\,\big|\,i\in I\bigr).
$$

We have the subset $\mathcal{S}p\bigl({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D}))\bigr)\subset\boldsymbol{C}^{I}$, and we have the following decomposition:

$$
{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{S}p\left({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D}))\right)}{}^{I}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}},\boldsymbol{\gamma}\bigr),\qquad {}^{I}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}},\boldsymbol{\gamma}\bigr)=\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}},q_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\bigr).
$$

For a pair $\boldsymbol{u}=(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ such that $\boldsymbol{c}\in\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$, we put as follows:

$$
{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})={}^{I}\mathbb{E}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D}),\boldsymbol{\gamma}).
$$

We obtain the following subset:

$$
\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I):=\bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{I}\times\boldsymbol{C}^{I}\,\big|\,{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})\neq 0\bigr\}\subset\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i).
$$

For any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)$, we put as follows:

$$
\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}):=\dim{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}).
$$

The number $\mathfrak{m}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})$ is called the multiplicity of $\boldsymbol{u}$. We have the natural $\mathbb{Z}^{I}$-action on $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)$ which preserves the multiplicities. We put as follows:

$$
\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)=\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)/\mathbb{Z}^{I},\qquad \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I):=\bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)\,\big|\,b_i-1<c_i\leq b_i\bigr\}.
$$

Recall that we have the morphism $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda):\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{0},i)\longrightarrow\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$. It induces the morphism $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda):\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{0},i)\longrightarrow\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)$.

Proposition 8.8 *The morphism above induces $\mathfrak{k}_I(\lambda) : \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, I) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, I)$, and we have equality $\mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \mathfrak{m}(\lambda, \mathfrak{k}_I(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}))$.*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\prod_{i\in I} \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$, then we obtain $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) \in \prod_{i\in I} \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$. Assume $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$. Then we have the vector bundle over $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}, \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E}).$$

We use the following lemma.

Lemma 8.69 *The following holds for any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}, \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)}(\mathcal{E})_{|\mathcal{D}_I^\lambda} = \mathrm{Gr}^{F, \mathbb{E}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda).$$

Proof We have only to check the case $\dim(X) = 1$. It follows from Lemma 8.66. ▮

To show Proposition 8.8, let us consider the following condition for λ and $\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_{i\in I} \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$:

$P(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})$: $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, I)$.

Lemma 8.70 *Let us pick $\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_{i\in I} \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$. For any λ, there exists a positive number $\eta(\lambda)$ such that the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- *$P(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})$ holds*
- *$P(\lambda', \boldsymbol{u})$ holds for some $\lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda, \eta(\lambda))$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 8.69. ▮

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 8.8. Let us take any point $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We have the line $\ell = \{t \cdot \lambda \,|\, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ in the plane $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We can pick a finite subset $S = \{t_1, \ldots, t_h\} \subset [0, 1]$ such that $\ell \subset \bigcup_{t_i \in S} \Delta\bigl(t_i \cdot \lambda, \eta(t_i \cdot \lambda)\bigr)$. Then it follows the equivalence of $P(0)$ and $P(\lambda)$. Thus the proof of Proposition 8.8 is accomplished. ▮

8.9 The induced vector bundle

8.9.1 The induced vector bundles ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$. Let us pick $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We put $(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) := \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) \in \boldsymbol{R}^l \times \boldsymbol{C}^l$. Let us pick any sufficiently small $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that $b_i + \epsilon_1 \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ for any i. By considering the prolongment ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}$, we obtain the vector bundle over $D_{\underline{l}} \times \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}} := {}^{\underline{l}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}, \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Clearly, it does not depend on a choice of ϵ_1 on a neighbourhood of λ_0.

Let us pick $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. We put $\bigl(\boldsymbol{b}(\lambda), \boldsymbol{\beta}(\lambda)\bigr) := \mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})$. Let us pick ϵ_0' as $\Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \supset \Delta(\lambda, \epsilon_0')$. We have the following vector bundles on $\mathcal{D}^\circ_{\underline{l}}(\lambda, \epsilon_0')$:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \qquad {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\Delta(\lambda, \epsilon_0')}.$$

Lemma 8.71 *The vector bundles ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\Delta(\lambda, \epsilon_0')}$ are naturally isomorphic.*

Proof Note that we have the following decomposition:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)}, \, \boldsymbol{\beta}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}^{\circ\,*}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}' \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}), \\ \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}') = \boldsymbol{\beta}}} {}^{\underline{l}}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\circ\,*}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)}, \, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}')\bigr).$$

We have the following:

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{D}^{\circ}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda,\epsilon'_0)} = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl(\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{D}^{\circ}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\,\boldsymbol{\beta}\bigr)\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}^{\circ}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda,\epsilon'_0)} \simeq \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}^{\circ}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda,\epsilon'_0)},\,\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\bigr).
$$

On the other hand, we have ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}} = \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda)}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}^{\circ}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda,\epsilon'_0)},\,\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$. Thus we are done. ∎

Thus we obtain the vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ over $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$. When we distinguish the dependence of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on the harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$, we use the notation ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$, or simply ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$.

8.9.2 The induced frame

Let $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$ be a compatible frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. For each section v_i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$ such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)=\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}(v_i))$. For any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l}\bigr)$, we put as follows:

$$
\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \bigl(z^{-\boldsymbol{n}}\cdot v_i\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)+\boldsymbol{n}=\boldsymbol{u}\bigr).
$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{n}$ is determined by $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$, not by v_i.

Lemma 8.72 *The tuple of sections $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ induces the frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.*

Proof First we remark the following: Let $\boldsymbol{n}$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^l$. We put $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}:=\bigl(z^{-\boldsymbol{n}}v_i\bigr)$. Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives the frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

It is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ induces the tuple of sections of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. By using the remark above, we can show that $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is a frame. ∎

8.9.3 The nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}_{i,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and the pairing with the dual

We have the endomorphism $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ on $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. The unique eigenvalue of $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\lambda}$ is $\mathfrak{e}\bigl(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$. Hence the nilpotent part $\mathcal{N}_{i\,\boldsymbol{u}}:=\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})-\mathfrak{e}\bigl(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$ gives the holomorphic endomorphism.

Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and $\epsilon_0>0$. We have the naturally defined morphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\bigl({}_{-\boldsymbol{b}+(1-\epsilon)\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}\bigr)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is the morphism of λ-connections. It is easy to see that ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ are preserved over $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Thus we obtain the following morphism over $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E})\otimes{}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,-\boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E}^{\vee})\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}.
$$

Then we obtain the morphism $S:{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)\otimes{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^{\vee})\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}}$.

Lemma 8.73 *We have the equality $S\bigl(\mathcal{N}_{i\,\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)+S\bigl(\mathrm{id}\otimes\mathcal{N}_{i,-\boldsymbol{u}}\bigr)=0$.*

Proof It follows from $S\bigl(\mathbb{D}\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)+S\bigl(\mathrm{id}\otimes\mathbb{D}\bigr)=\mathbb{D}\circ S$. ∎

8.9.4 Functoriality for dual

Due to the results in the subsubsection 8.9.3, we obtain the naturally defined morphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^{\vee})\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)^{\vee}$.

Lemma 8.74 *The naturally defined morphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^{\vee})\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)^{\vee}$ is isomorphic.*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$. The dual frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}$ gives the frame of ${}_{-\boldsymbol{b}+(1-\epsilon)\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}$ for some positive constant ϵ. It is also compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$. By using Lemma 8.72, $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\bigl(\boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}\bigr)_{-\boldsymbol{u}}$ induce the frames of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^{\vee})$ respectively. Thus we are done. ∎

8.9.5 Functoriality for tensor products

Let $(E_i, \overline{\partial}_{E_i}, \theta_i, h_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be tame harmonic bundles over $X - D$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be elements of $KMS(\mathcal{E}_i^0, \underline{l})$. We have the induced morphisms on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$$ {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_1)}(\mathcal{E}_1) \otimes {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_2)}(\mathcal{E}_2) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{u}_2)}(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2), $$

$$ {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_1)}(\mathcal{E}_1) \otimes {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_2)}(\mathcal{E}_2) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^F_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{u}_2)}(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2). $$

Since the morphism is compatible with the residues of the λ-connections, we obtain the following induced morphisms:

$$ F_{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1} \otimes {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{u}_2}. $$

Lemma 8.75 *The morphism $F_{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2}$ is compatible with the nilpotent morphisms of the induced vector bundles.*

Proof It is clear from our construction. ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{b}_i$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$.

Lemma 8.76 *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}_1^0 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2^0, \underline{l})$. We have the isomorphism:*

$$ \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}_i \in \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}_i}\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}), \\ \boldsymbol{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{u}_2 = \boldsymbol{u}}} {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\mathcal{E}_1) \otimes {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}(\mathcal{E}_2) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2). $$

Proof We can show the lemma by using Lemma 8.72. ▮

8.9.6 Functoriality for pull backs

We put $X^{(1)} := \Delta_z^n$ and $X^{(2)} := \Delta_\zeta^m$. We put $D_i^{(2)} := \{\zeta_i = 0\}$ and $D^{(2)} := \bigcup_{i=1}^l D_i^{(2)}$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X^{(2)} - D^{(2)}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{c} = \bigl(c_{j\,i} \bigm| 1 \leq j \leq n,\ 1 \leq i \leq m\bigr)$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{n \cdot m}$. Let us consider the morphism $\psi : X_1 \longrightarrow X_2$ given as follows:

$$ \psi^*(\zeta_i) := \prod_{j=1}^n z_j^{c_{j\,i}}. $$

We put $D^{(1)} := \psi^{-1} D^{(2)}$. We obtain the harmonic bundle $\psi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ over $X^{(1)} - D^{(1)}$.

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0 such that ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ is locally free on $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ for some $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$. Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}^{(2)}}\mathcal{E}$ which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. We have the elements $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$ for each v_i satisfying the following:

$$ \deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)). $$

We put as follows:

$$ v_i' := v_i \cdot \prod_{k=1}^l |\zeta_k|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_k(v_i))}, \quad \boldsymbol{v}' = (v_i'). $$

We have already seen that C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ on $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) - \mathcal{D}^{(2)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ is adapted up to log order.

We obtain the holomorphic frame $\psi^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}$ and the C^∞-frame $\psi^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}'$ of $\psi^{-1}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) - \mathcal{D}^{(1)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Note that $\psi^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order.

We put as follows:

$$ \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i) := \Bigl(\sum_k c_{1\,k} \cdot u_k(v_i), \ldots, \sum_k c_{n\,k} \cdot u_k(v_i)\Bigr) \in (\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C})^n. $$

The elements $\boldsymbol{n}(v_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ are determined by the following conditions:

$$ \boldsymbol{b}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\delta} < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)) + \boldsymbol{n}_i \leq \boldsymbol{b}^{(1)}. $$

We put as follows:

$$w_i := \psi^* v_i \cdot \prod z_j^{-n_j}, \quad \boldsymbol{w} = (w_i).$$

Then $\boldsymbol{w}$ is a tuple of sections of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}^{(1)}+\eta\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\psi^*\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_1)$. Here η denotes any small positive number, and a small positive number ϵ_1 depends η.

We put $\boldsymbol{d}(w_i) := \mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\bigr) + \boldsymbol{n}_i$. We put as follows:

$$w_i' := w_i \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n} |z_j|^{d_j(w_i)}, \quad \boldsymbol{w}' := (w_i').$$

Thus we obtain C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{w}'$ of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_1) - \mathcal{D}^{(1)}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_1)$.

Lemma 8.77 *The tuple $\boldsymbol{w}'$ is adapted up to log order.*

Proof It is easy to see that we have some C^∞-functions f_i such that $w_i' = f_i \cdot \psi^{-1} v_i'$ and $|f_i| = 1$ hold. Since $\psi^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}$ is adapted up to log order, we obtain the lemma. ▮

Lemma 8.78 *The tuple $\boldsymbol{w}$ gives the frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}^{(1)}+\eta\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\psi^*\mathcal{E}$. It is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.*

Proof The first claim and the compatibility with $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ follow from Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5.

Let $A = \sum A_k \cdot d\zeta_k/\zeta_k$ denote the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e., $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v}\cdot A$. Then we have $\psi^*\mathbb{D}\psi^*\boldsymbol{v} = \psi^*\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\psi^*A$. We have the following:

$$\psi^* A = \sum_i \sum_j \frac{dz_j}{z_j} \cdot c_{j\,i} \cdot \psi^* A_i.$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$\psi^*\mathbb{D}\cdot\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{w}\cdot\sum_j \Bigl(\sum_k c_{j\,k}\cdot\psi^* A_k + N_j\Bigr)\cdot\frac{dz_j}{z_j}.$$

Here N denotes the diagonal matrix whose i-th component is $-n_j(v_i)$. Then it is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{w}$ is compatible with the decompositions ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. ▮

We have the naturally defined morphism $\psi^{*\,\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}(\psi^* E)$.

Lemma 8.79 *The following naturally defined morphism is isomorphic:*

$$\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_1} \psi^{*\,\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\psi^*(E)).$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 8.72 and Lemma 8.78. ▮

Corollary 8.14 *The correspondence $\boldsymbol{u} \longmapsto \boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}$ induces the surjective morphism $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\psi^*\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$. We have $\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_1} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}_1)$.* ▮

9 The KMS-structure on the spaces of the multi-valued flat sections

9.1 The filtration ${}^i\mathcal{F}$

9.1.1 Preliminary

We denote the space of the multi-valued flat sections by $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. Let ${}^iM^\lambda$ denote the monodromy of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ with respect to the loop around the divisor $\mathcal{D}_i^\lambda$. We obtain the tuple of endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{M} = ({}^1M, \ldots, {}^lM)$. Then we obtain the generalized eigen decomposition:

$$H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M})} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr).$$

We denote the restriction of $\boldsymbol{M}$ to $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})$ by $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. We obtain the tuple of endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{N}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = ({}^1N_{\boldsymbol{\omega}},\ldots,{}^lN_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})$ given as follows:

$$ {}^iN_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} := \frac{-1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\log {}^iM^u_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}. $$

Here ${}^iM^u_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ denotes the unipotent part of ${}^iM_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_1,\ldots,b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}=(\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}^l$. We put as follows:

$$ \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{\omega}) := \big(\alpha(b_1,\omega_1),\ldots,\alpha(b_l,\omega_l)\big). $$

Here $\alpha(b,\omega)$ for $(b,\omega)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ is given in the page 134.

9.1.2 The increasing order and the filtration ${}^i\mathcal{F}$

Let s be an element of $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})$. Let P be an element of D_i°. Then we put ${}^i\operatorname{ord}(s) := \operatorname{ord}(s_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)})$.

Lemma 9.1 *The number* ${}^i\operatorname{ord}(s)$ *is independent of a choice of* P.

Proof Let P and P' be two points of D_i°. Let γ be a path in D_i° connecting P and P'.

Since s is holomorphic with respect to $\overline{\partial}_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}$, we have the equality $d(s,s)_h = (\partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}s,s)_h + (s,\partial_{\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}}s) = 2\operatorname{Re}\big((\bar{\lambda}+\lambda^{-1})\cdot(\theta s,s)\big)$. Hence we obtain the following equality:

$$ d\log|s|_h^2 = -2\operatorname{Re}\Big((\bar{\lambda}+\lambda^{-1})\cdot\frac{(\theta s,s)_h}{|s|_h^2}.\Big) $$

Let q_i be the projection of $X=\Delta^n$ onto the i-th component. Let Q be any point of $\Delta-\{O\}$, and then $q_i^{-1}(Q)$ is a hyperplane of X. Due to the estimate of θ (Lemma 8.7, for example), there exists a positive constant C which is independent of Q, satisfying the following inequality on $q_i^{-1}(Q)$:

$$ \big|d\log|s|^2_{h\,|\,q_i^{-1}(Q)}\big| \leq C\cdot\Big(\sum_{j\neq i}\frac{1}{|z_j|}\Big). $$

Thus we obtain the following inequality on the path $\gamma_Q := q_i^{-1}(Q)\cap\pi_i^{-1}(\gamma)$ for some constant C which is independent of Q:

$$ \big|d\log|s_{|\gamma_Q}|_h^2\big| \leq C. $$

Hence we obtain the following estimate, which is independent of Q:

$$ \Big|\log\big|s_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}(Q)\big|_h - \log\big|s_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P')}(Q)\big|_h\Big| < C' $$

It implies our claim. ∎

Let s be an element of $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$: We put as follows:

$$ F(s,\boldsymbol{b}) := \exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{l}\log z_i\cdot\big(\alpha(b_i,\omega_i)+{}^iN_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)\Big)\cdot s. $$

Then $F(s,\boldsymbol{b})$ is a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $X-D$. We put as follows:

$$ c_i := -{}^i\operatorname{ord}(s) - \operatorname{Re}(\alpha(b_i,\omega_i)). $$

We put $\boldsymbol{c} := (c_i)$.

Lemma 9.2 $F(s,\boldsymbol{b})$ *is a holomorphic section of* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Proof Due to the result in the case of curves (Lemma 7.44), we obtain the following for any point $P \in D_i^{\circ}$:

$$-\operatorname{ord}\bigl(F(s,\boldsymbol{b})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\bigr) \leq c_i$$

Then we obtain the result due to Corollary 2.6. ∎

Corollary 9.1 *$F\bigl(s,-\mathbf{ord}(s)\bigr)$ is a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.* ∎

We put as follows:

$${}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \bigl\{s \in \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}) \bigm| -{}^{i}\operatorname{ord}(s) \leq a\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 9.3 *The monodromies preserves the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a$.*

Proof It immediately follows from the definition of the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ and Lemma 9.1. ∎

9.1.3 Functoriality of ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$

For a positive integer c, we have the morphism $\psi_{c\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i} : X \longrightarrow X$ given by $(z_1,\ldots,z_n) \longmapsto (z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1},z_i^c,z_{i+1},\ldots,z_n)$. We have the natural isomorphism $\psi^*_{c\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}} : H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \simeq H(\psi^{-1}_{c\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ via the pull back.

Lemma 9.4 *Under the isomorphism, we have the following:*

$$\psi^*_{c\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) = {}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{c\cdot a} H\bigl(\psi^{-1}_{c\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)$$

Proof It can be reduced to the case of curves (Lemma 7.60). ∎

We have the natural isomorphism $H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}) \simeq H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda}) \otimes H(\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda})$. We have the following isomorphism:

$$\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\omega}_2=\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_1\bigr) \otimes \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_2\bigr).$$

Then we have the two filtrations on $\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$. One is ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ for $\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$. The other is induced by ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ for $\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(b)\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$ for $b=1,2$.

Lemma 9.5 *They are same. Namely the following holds:*

$${}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a\Bigl(\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda},\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\Bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\omega}_2=\boldsymbol{\omega}} \sum_{a_1+a_2\leq a} {}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{a_1}\Bigl(\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(b)\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_1\bigr)\Bigr) \otimes {}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{a_2}\Bigl(\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(b)\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_2\bigr)\Bigr).$$

Proof Due to the result in the case of curves, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a\Bigl(\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\Bigr) \\
&\qquad \simeq \bigoplus_{\omega_1\cdot\omega_2=\boldsymbol{\omega}} \sum_{a_1+a_2\leq a} {}^{i}\mathcal{F}\Bigl(\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}_1)=\omega_1} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(1)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_1\bigr)\Bigr) \otimes {}^{i}\mathcal{F}\Bigl(\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}_2)=\omega_2} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{(2)\,\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}_2\bigr)\Bigr). \qquad (216)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the monodromy endomorphisms M_j^{λ} $(j \neq i)$ preserve the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$, we obtain the results. ∎

We have the following isomorphism:

$$H\Bigl(\bigotimes^{R}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\Bigr) \simeq \bigotimes^{R} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}). \qquad (217)$$

We have the following isomorphism:

$$\mathbb{E}\Bigl(H\Bigl(\bigotimes^{R}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\Bigr),\boldsymbol{\omega}\Bigr) \simeq \bigoplus_{f\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega},R)} \bigotimes_{\boldsymbol{\omega}'\in\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})} \bigotimes^{f(\boldsymbol{\omega}')} \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}'\bigr). \qquad (218)$$

Here we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, R) := \Big\{ f : \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \,\Big|\, \sum f(\boldsymbol{\omega}') = R, \quad \prod \boldsymbol{\omega}'^{\,f(\boldsymbol{\omega}')} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \Big\}.$$

We naturally have the filtrations on the both sides of (217) and (218).

Corollary 9.2 *The filtrations of the both sides* (217) *and* (218) *are preserved by the isomorphisms.* ■

We have the isomorphism $H(\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}) \simeq H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee}$. preserving the $\mathbb{E}$-decomposition.

$$\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}) \simeq \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee}, \boldsymbol{\omega}). \tag{219}$$

On the left hand side of (219), we have the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$. On the right hand side of (219), we have the induced filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{\vee}$ by ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$, given as follows:

$${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{\vee}_{a} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee} := \big\{ f \in H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})^{\vee} \,\big|\, f\big({}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{b} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\big) \subset {}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{a+b} H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\ (\forall b \in \boldsymbol{R}) \big\}.$$

Lemma 9.6 *The isomorphism preserves the filtrations.*

Proof It can be reduced to the case of curves (Lemma 7.59) by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 9.5. ■

9.1.4 The case λ is generic

Assume that λ is generic. Recall that $\mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda) : \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{0}, i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}p^{f}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ is isomorphic for any i.

Lemma 9.7 *The filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega})$ is trivial in the following sense:*

> *For each i, we have the unique element $u_i \in \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{0}, i)$ such that $\omega_i = \mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda, u_i)$. Then ${}^{i}\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{b} \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}) \neq 0$ if and only if $b = \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda, u_i)$.*

Proof It follows from the result in the case of curves (the subsubsection 7.4.11). ■

Corollary 9.3 *If λ is generic, then the filtrations $({}^{i}\mathcal{F} \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, l)$ are compatible.*

Proof It immediately follows Lemma 9.7 . ■

Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$ be generic, and let $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_l)$ be an element of $\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})$. We have the unique element $u_i \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, 0, i)$ such that $\mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda, u_i) = \omega_i$.

Lemma 9.8 *Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}^{l}$ whose i-th component is $\beta_i = \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i)$. Recall that we have the space $\mathbb{E}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, which is a generalized eigenspace of the tuple $\operatorname{Res}_{\underline{l}}(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$. Then we have the isomorphism:*

$$\mathbb{E}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \simeq \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}).$$

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be base of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}$. We put $\boldsymbol{\omega}(s_j) := \mathbf{deg}^{\mathbb{E}}(s_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{b}(s_j) := \mathbf{deg}^{\mathcal{F}}(s_j)$.

We put $v_j := F(s_j, \boldsymbol{b}(s_j))$. Then we obtain the tuple $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ of sections of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. Due to the result in the case of curves, $\boldsymbol{v}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}$. Thus $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. The frames $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{s}$ induce the isomorphism desired. ■

Corollary 9.4 *Assume that λ is generic. For any $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})$, we have the unique element $\boldsymbol{u} \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{0}, \underline{l})$ such that $\mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{\omega}$.* ■

Corollary 9.5 *Assume $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})$. We have the following equalities:*

$$\dim {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Big(\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega})\Big) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) & (\boldsymbol{b} \geq \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

$$\dim {}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Big(\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega})\Big) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) & (\boldsymbol{b} = \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

■

9.1.5 The family of the space of the multi-valued flat sections

Let $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}(E)$ be the holomorphic vector bundle over $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$, obtained by $\mathcal{H}_{|\lambda}=H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. We have the monodromy endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{M}=(M_i\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l)$, where M_i denotes the monodromy with respect to D_i.

Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$. We put $S_0:=\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda_0})$. Let ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 be sufficiently small numbers. Then we obtain the following decompositions, (see (12) for the notation $\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}$):

$$\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in S_0}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}},\qquad \mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}:={}^{\underline{l}}\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_1}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\big).$$

We put $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}):=\big\{\boldsymbol{u}\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})\,\big|\,\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\omega}\big\}$. We may assume that any $\lambda\in\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is generic. Then we have the following decomposition on $\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:

$$\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega})}\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})},\qquad \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\lambda}=\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})).$$

As in the case of the curves, we consider the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$. We put as follows:

$$ {}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega})\\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u}))\leq d}}\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}. \tag{220}$$

Since it is given as the sum of the generalized eigenspaces, the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ can be prolonged to the filtration of $\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\omega}$, which we denote by ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Note the following isomorphism for any $P\in D_i^{\circ}$:

$$H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\simeq H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}).$$

We have the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ on the right hand side.

Lemma 9.9

- *Under the isomorphism above, we have* $\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\omega}=\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$.
- $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d}\mathcal{H}_{\omega}=\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$.
- *In particular, we have* $\big({}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{d}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)_{|\lambda_0}={}^{i}\mathcal{F}\big(\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\big)$. $\blacksquare$

9.2 The compatibility of the filtrations ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$

9.2.1 The dimension and the virtual dimension

For any λ, pick $\boldsymbol{\omega}\in\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})$ and $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^{l}$. We put as follows:

$$d(\lambda,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a}):=\dim{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}),\qquad v.d(\lambda,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a}):=\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega})\\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\leq\boldsymbol{a}}}\mathfrak{m}(0,\boldsymbol{u}).$$

Lemma 9.10 *Let λ_0 be any element of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. We have the inequality $d(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a})\geq v.d(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a})$.*

Proof Let us pick a sufficiently small positive number ϵ. Then we have the following inequality, for any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

$$d(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a})=\dim\Big(\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a_i}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda_0}\Big)\geq\dim\Big(\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a_i}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda}\Big). \tag{221}$$

For any generic $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the following equality:

$$^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a_i}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_i)\leq a_i}} \mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\lambda}.$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{l} {}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a_i}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\leq \boldsymbol{a}}} \mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\lambda}.$$

Therefore we obtain the following equality, due to Corollary 9.5.

$$\dim \bigcap_{i=1}^{l} {}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a_i}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda} = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\leq \boldsymbol{a}}} \dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\lambda} = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\leq \boldsymbol{a}}} \mathfrak{m}(0,\boldsymbol{u}) = v.d(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{a}). \tag{222}$$

We obtain the result from (221) and (222). ∎

9.2.2 Preliminary proposition

Let us consider the compatibility of the filtrations ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$. We may assume that $l = n$. We put $X^{(1)} := \{(z_1, \ldots, z_n)\,|\,z_{n-1} = z_n\} \subset X$. We put $D^{(1)}_i := D_i \cap X^{(1)}$ for $i \leq n-1$. We have the natural isomorphism $X^{(1)} \simeq \Delta^{n-1} = \{(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}) \in \Delta^{n-1}\}$. We have the natural isomorphism $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda) \longrightarrow H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}})$.

We have the tuple of monodromies $\boldsymbol{M} := (M_1, \ldots, M_n)$ and $\boldsymbol{M}^{(1)} := (M^{(1)}_1, \ldots, M^{(1)}_{n-1})$. Here we have the following:

$$M^{(1)}_i = \begin{cases} M_i & (i \leq n-2) \\ M_{n-1}\circ M_n & (i = n-1). \end{cases}$$

For any $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M})$, $\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{(1)})$ is given as follows:

$$q_i(\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega})) = \begin{cases} \omega_i & (i \leq n-2) \\ \omega_{n-1}\cdot\omega_n & (i = n-1). \end{cases}$$

The map $\phi : \boldsymbol{R}^n \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{n-1}$ is defined as follows:

$$q_i(\phi(\boldsymbol{a})) = \begin{cases} a_i & (i \leq n-2) \\ a_{n-1} + a_n & (i = n-1). \end{cases}$$

We have the filtrations ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ on $\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega})$. For any $\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n$, we have the subspace ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} {}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{a_i}$ of $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$. We put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\lneq\boldsymbol{a}} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}}.$$

Here $\boldsymbol{b} \lneq \boldsymbol{a}$ means $\boldsymbol{b} \leq \boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \neq \boldsymbol{a}$.

We also have the filtrations on $\mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}}), \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}\big)$, which we denote by ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$. Similarly, we have ${}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}}$ and ${}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}'^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}}$ for any $\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n-1}$.

Lemma 9.11 *We have the following implication:*

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}) \subset {}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\phi(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda_{|X^{(1)}}), \phi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\big).$$

Proof Let s be an element of the left hand side. Let P be any point of D_i°. Then we have the following for any $i = 1, \dots, n$:

$$-\operatorname{ord}\big(F(s, \boldsymbol{b})_{|\pi_i^{-1}(P)}\big) \leq a_i - \operatorname{Re}\big(\alpha(b_i, \omega_i)\big).$$

Let C be the subset of $X^{(1)} \simeq \Delta^{n-1}$ such that $C = \pi_{n-1}^{-1}(P)$ for a point $P \in D_{n-1}^{(1)} - \bigcup_{i<n-1} D_{n-1}^{(1)} \cap D_i^{(1)}$. The inclusion $C \subset X$ is obtained by the diagonal embedding $\{P\} \times \Delta_{n-1} \longrightarrow \{P\} \times \Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_n$. We have the following, due to Corollary 2.6:

$$-\operatorname{ord}(F(s, \boldsymbol{b})_{|C}) \leq a_{n-1} + a_n - \operatorname{Re}(\alpha(b_n + b_{n-1}, \omega_n \cdot \omega_{n-1})).$$

It implies $-\operatorname{ord}(s_{|C}) \leq a_{n-1} + a_n$ due to Lemma 7.44. Hence we have the inequality:

$${}^{n-1}\deg^{\mathcal{F}^{(1)}}(s) \leq a_{n-1} + a_n.$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Proposition 9.1 *The following holds.*

(A) $d(\lambda, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{a}) = v.d(\lambda, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{a})$.

(B) *The following morphism is isomorphic:*

$$\sum_{\substack{\phi(\boldsymbol{a}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)} \\ \phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}}} \Big({}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\Big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X^{(1)}}), \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}\big).$$

(C) *The following morphism is injective.*

$$\frac{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)}{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)} \longrightarrow \frac{{}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\phi(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X^{(1)}}), \phi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\big)}{{}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}'^{(1)}_{\phi(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X^{(1)}}), \phi(\boldsymbol{\omega})\big)}.$$

The proposition will be proved in the subsubsections 9.2.3–9.2.4.

Before entering the proof, we simplify the problem. Considering the morphism $\psi_c^{-1}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, z_n^c)$, we may assume the following for some $\epsilon > 0$. (Note Lemma 9.4):

Assumption D For any $a, b \in \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n)$ such that $a \neq b$, and for any $\lambda' \in \Delta(\lambda, \epsilon)$,

$$|a - b| > \sum_{c \in \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1)} |c|.$$

Lemma 9.12 *Under the assumption D, the following holds:*

1. *The morphism $\mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n) \times \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}$ given by $(a, b) \longmapsto a + b$ is injective. In particular, it induces the total order $\leq_1$ on the set $\mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n) \times \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1)$.*
2. *We have the natural orders on $\mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ $(i = n, n-1)$, and we obtain the lexicographic order $\leq_2$ on $\mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n) \times \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1)$. We have the equality $\leq_1 = \leq_2$.*

Proof It immediately follows from our assumption above. ∎

9.2.3 A proof of the claims (A) and (B) of Proposition 9.1

Let $\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{n-1}$, whose i-th components are $a_i^{(1)}$. Then the element $(a_n^{\circ}, a_{n-1}^{\circ}) \in \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n) \times \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1)$ is determined as follows:

$$(a_n^{\circ}, a_{n-1}^{\circ}) := \max\bigl\{(b_n, b_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n) \times \mathcal{P}ar^f(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, n-1) \,\bigm|\, b_n + b_{n-1} \leq a_{n-1}^{(1)}\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 9.13 *We have the following equality:*

$$\sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{a}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} = \Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr) + \Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr). \tag{223}$$

Here we put $\boldsymbol{a}' := (a_1^{(1)}, \ldots, a_{n-2}^{(1)}) \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n-2}$.

Proof It is clear that ${}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}}$ is contained in the left hand side of (223). Under the assumption (D), we have ${}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}} = {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_b \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}-\eta}$ for some real numbers b and η such that $b + a_n^{\circ} - \eta < a_{n-1}^{(1)}$. Thus ${}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}}$ is contained in the left hand side of (223). Thus we obtain the implication $\supset$.

Next, we would like to show the implication $\subset$. We have only to show that ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$ is contained in the right hand side when we have $\phi(\boldsymbol{a}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$.

Under the assumption D, the condition $\phi(\boldsymbol{a}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$ implies the following:

$$a_i \leq a_i^{(1)},\ (i \leq n-2), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{cases} a_n < a_n^{\circ}, \\ \quad \text{or}, \\ a_n = a_n^{\circ},\ a_{n-1} \leq a_{n-1}^{\circ}. \end{cases}$$

Then the implication $\subset$ immediately follows. $\blacksquare$

We will show the claims (A) and (B) in Proposition 9.1 by an induction on n. We assume that the claims (A) and (B) for $n-1$, and we will show that the claims (A) and (B) hold for n.

Let us consider the following claims:

$(A, a, \leq)$ (A) holds for any $\boldsymbol{a}$ such that $a_n + a_{n-1} \leq a$.

$(A, a, <)$ (A) holds for any $\boldsymbol{a}$ such that $a_n + a_{n-1} < a$.

$(B, a, \leq)$ (B) holds for any $\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$ such that $a_{n-1}^{(1)} \leq a$.

$(B, a, <)$ (B) holds for any $\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}$ such that $a_{n-1}^{(1)} < a$.

If a is sufficiently negative, then $(A, a, \leq)$ and $(B, a, \leq)$ are true trivially.

Lemma 9.14 $(A, a, <)$ *implies* $(B, a, \leq)$ *and* $(A, a, \leq)$.

Proof We have the following implication:

$$\Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr) + \Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr) \subset {}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}}. \tag{224}$$

We also have the following:

$$\Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr) \cap \Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}}\Bigr) = {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}}.$$

Thus we have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim\Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^{\circ}} \cap \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\Bigr) &\leq \dim\bigl({}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}} \cap \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\bigr) \\ + \dim\bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^{\circ}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}} \cap \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\bigr) &- \dim\Bigl({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}''} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^{\circ}} \cap \mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\Bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{225}$$

By using the assumption of the induction on n, or by using $(A, a, <)$, we obtain the following equality:

$$\dim\Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^\circ} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in S_1(\boldsymbol{\omega})} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}), \tag{226}$$

$$S_1(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i) \leq a_i^{(1)} \ (i \leq n-2),\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_n) < a_n^\circ\big\}$$

By using $(A, a, <)$, we obtain the following:

$$\dim\Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^\circ} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n^\circ} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in S_2(\boldsymbol{\omega})} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}), \tag{227}$$

$$S_2(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i) \leq a_i^{(1)},\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_{n-1}) \leq a_{n-1}^\circ,\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_n) < a_n^\circ\big\}.$$

Due to the assumption of the induction on n, we have the following:

$$\dim\big({}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}\big)\big) = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}) \\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}^{(1)}}} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \omega^{(1)}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in S_3(\boldsymbol{\omega})} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}), \tag{228}$$

$$S_3(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i) \leq a_i^{(1)} \ (i \leq n-2),\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_{n-1}) + \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_n) \leq a_{n-1}^{(1)}\big\}.$$

We put $S_4(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := S_3(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - \big(S_1(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - S_2(\boldsymbol{\omega})\big)$. It is easy to check the following:

$$S_4 = \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i) \leq a_i \ (i \leq n-2),\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_i) \leq a_i^\circ \ (i = n-1, n)\big\}.$$

Then we obtain the following inequality by a direct calculation from (225), (226), (227) and (228):

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \boldsymbol{\omega}'} \dim\Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^\circ} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^\circ} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\Big) &\leq \sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \omega^{(1)}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in S_4(\boldsymbol{\omega})} \mathfrak{m}(0, \boldsymbol{u}) \\ &= \sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(1)}} v.d(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{\omega}). \end{aligned} \tag{229}$$

Here $\boldsymbol{a}$ is determined by $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = a_i^{(1)}$ for $i \leq n-2$ and $q_i(\boldsymbol{a}) = a_i^\circ$ for $i = n-1, n$. On the other hand, we have already known the inequality (Lemma 9.10):

$$\dim\Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}^\circ} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n^\circ} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)\Big) \geq v.d(\lambda, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{\omega}). \tag{230}$$

From (229) and (230), we can conclude that the equality in (230) holds, which implies $(A, a, \leq)$. We can also conclude that the equality in (225) holds, which implies that the equality in (224) holds. Thus we obtain $(B, a, \leq)$. Thus the proof of Lemma 9.14 is accomplished. ∎

For any a and some $\epsilon > 0$, the following implications are clear:

$$\begin{gathered}(B, a, \leq) \Longrightarrow (B, a + \epsilon, <) \\ (A, a, \leq) \Longrightarrow (A, a + \epsilon, <).\end{gathered}$$

Hence we obtain (A, a) and (B, a) for any a. Thus the induction on n can proceed. Namely the proof of the claims (A) and (B) of Proposition 9.1 is accomplished.

9.2.4 A proof of the claim (C) of Proposition 9.1

Now we shall prove the claim (C). The following inclusion is surjective, due to (B):

$$\sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{b}) \lneq \phi(\boldsymbol{a})} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n-1}}\mathcal{F}'^{(1)}_{\phi(\boldsymbol{a})} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big).$$

Thus it is isomorphic.

Lemma 9.15 *Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. Assume $\phi(\boldsymbol{b}) \lneq \phi(\boldsymbol{a})$. We put $\boldsymbol{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_{n-2}) \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n-2}$. Then we have one of the following:*

- ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} \subset {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n}$.
- ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} \subset {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{<a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n}$.
- ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} \subset {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n}$.

Proof The condition implies $b_i \leq a_i$ $(i \leq n-2)$ and $b_{n-1} + b_n \leq a_{n-1} + a_n$, and at least one of the inequalities is not equality. Then we have at least one of the following:

- $b_n \leq a_n$.
- $b_n = a_n$ and $b_{n-1} \leq a_{n-1}$.
- $b_n = a_n$, $b_{n-1} = a_{n-1}$, $(b_1, \dots, b_{n-2}) \leq \boldsymbol{a}'$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_{n-2}) \neq \boldsymbol{a}'$.

Then the claim follows. ∎

Lemma 9.16 *We have the following:*

$$
{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \Big(\sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{b}) \lneq \phi(\boldsymbol{a})} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} \Big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \lneq \boldsymbol{a}} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} = {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}}. \tag{231}
$$

Proof We have the following:

$$
\sum_{\phi(\boldsymbol{b}) \lneq \phi(\boldsymbol{a})} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n} \Big) + \Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{<a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n} + {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n} \Big). \tag{232}
$$

Note that the second term in the right hand side of (232) is contained in ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}}$. Let us pick elements: $x \in {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{<a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n} + {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n}$ and $y \in {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap ({}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n})$. Assume $x + y \in {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}}$. Then we obtain $y \in {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n}$. Hence we have $y \in {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n}$. Thus the left hand side of (231) is as follows:

$$
{}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{<a_n} + \Big({}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{<a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n} + {}^{\underline{n-2}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \cap {}^{n-1}\mathcal{F}_{a_{n-1}} \cap {}^{n}\mathcal{F}_{a_n} \Big).
$$

It is same as the right hand side of (231). Thus we are done. ∎

The claim (C) immediately follows Lemma 9.16. Thus the proof of Proposition 9.1 is accomplished. ∎

9.2.5 A consequence

Let C_0 be the diagonal curve: $C_0 := \{(z, \dots, z) \in \Delta^n\}$. The restriction gives the natural isomorphism $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}) \longrightarrow H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0})$. We have the filtration on the right hand side, which we denote by ${}^{C_0}\mathcal{F}$.

Corollary 9.6 *The following morphism is injective:*

$$
\frac{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)}{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}'_{\boldsymbol{a}} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)} \longrightarrow \frac{{}^{C_0}\mathcal{F}_{|\boldsymbol{a}|} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)}{{}^{C_0}\mathcal{F}'_{|\boldsymbol{a}|} \cap \mathbb{E}\big(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\omega}\big)}.
$$

Here $|\boldsymbol{a}|$ denotes $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$ for $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Proof We have only to use the claims (C) in Proposition 9.1 inductively. ∎

9.2.6 The compatibility of the filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{F}\,\big|\, i=1,\ldots,n\bigr)$

Let s be an element of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\cap\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$. Then we obtain the section $F(s,\boldsymbol{a})$ of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. For any i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,0,\underline{l})$, satisfying $\mathfrak{k}^{f}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})=(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})$. Due to the result in the case of curves (Lemma 7.44), we have ${}^{i}\deg^{F}F(s,\boldsymbol{a})\leq\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_i)$. We put $c_i:={}^{i}\deg^{F}F(s,\boldsymbol{a})$ and $\boldsymbol{c}:=(c_1,\ldots,c_n)$. We obtain the following map:

$$\Phi:{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}),\quad s\longmapsto F(s,\boldsymbol{u})(O).$$

Lemma 9.17 *The map* Φ *is injective.*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, which is compatible with $({}^{i}F\,|\,i=1,\ldots,n)$. We describe as follows:

$$F(s,\boldsymbol{a}):=\sum f_j\cdot v_j.$$

Assume that $\Phi(s)=0$. We have $f_j(O)=0$ unless $\mathbf{deg}(v_j)\lneq\boldsymbol{c}$. In this case, we have $-\mathrm{ord}(s_{|C_0})<|\boldsymbol{a}|$. It implies $s_{|C_0}\in{}^{C_0}\mathcal{F}'_{|\boldsymbol{a}|}H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|C_0})$. Then we obtain $s=0$ in ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})$, due to Corollary 9.6. ▮

We put $\gamma_i:=\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}:=(\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_n)$.

Lemma 9.18 *We have* $\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)\subset{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_{\underline{n}}\,\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\gamma}\bigr)$.

Proof We have only to check that $F(s,\boldsymbol{a})_{|(\lambda,P)}$ is contained in ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{c_i}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{D_i}),\gamma_i\bigr)$ for any $P\in D_i^{\circ}$. It follows from the result in the case of curves (Corollary 7.18). ▮

Thus we obtain the morphisms $\Phi_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}:{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\bigr)\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O}),\boldsymbol{\gamma})$. Then we obtain the following injection:

$$\bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}\Phi_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}:\bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\longrightarrow\bigoplus_{(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_{\underline{n}}\,\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\gamma}\bigr).$$

Proposition 9.2 *The morphisms* $\Phi_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}$ *are isomorphic.*

Proof Since $\Phi_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}$ is injective, we obtain the following inequalities:

$$\mathrm{rank}\,\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\leq\sum_{(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{\omega})}\dim{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,\mathbb{E}(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega})\leq\sum_{(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{\gamma})}\dim\mathbb{E}({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Res}_{\underline{n}}\,\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\gamma})=\mathrm{rank}\,\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}.\tag{233}$$

Then the proposition immediately follows. ▮

Theorem 9.1 *The tuple of the filtrations* $\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{F}\,\big|\,i=1,\ldots,n\bigr)$ *is compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.2.

Proof Due to (233), we have the following equality:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathrm{rank}\,{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})=\mathrm{rank}\,H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}).$$

It implies the compatibility of the filtrations, due to Lemma 4.2. ▮

Corollary 9.7

- *The tuple of the filtrations* $\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\big|\,i=1,\ldots,l\bigr)$ *are compatible.*
- *We have the following decomposition on* $\Delta^{*}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$*:*

$${}^{I}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\Delta^{*}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in S(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{b})}\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}.$$

Here we put $S(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{b}):=\bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^{0},I)\,\big|\,\mathfrak{e}^{f}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\omega},\ \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\leq\boldsymbol{b}\bigr\}$. ▮

9.2.7 Weak norm estimate

Let $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_i)$ be a frame of $\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$. For each s_i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(s_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$ such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}(s_i)=\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}(s_i))$. We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s}':=\bigl(s_i'\bigr),\quad s_i':=s_i\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{l}|z_j|^{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,u_j(s_i))}. \tag{234}$$

Lemma 9.19 *$\boldsymbol{s}'$ gives a C^∞-frame of $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, which is adapted up to log order.*

Proof It is easy to see the following inequality for some positive constants C_1 and M_1:

$$H(h,\boldsymbol{s}')\leq C_1\cdot\Bigl(-\sum_{j=1}^{l}\log|z_j|\Bigr)^{M_1}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{s}^\vee$ be the dual frame of $\boldsymbol{s}$. Due to the result in the case of curves, we have $\boldsymbol{u}(s_i^\vee)=-\boldsymbol{u}(s_i)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime}$ be the modification as in (234). We obtain the inequality $H(h,\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime})\leq C_2\cdot\bigl(-\sum_{j=1}^{l}\log|z_j|\bigr)^{M_2}$ for some positive constants C_2 and M_2. Since we have $H(h,\boldsymbol{s}')\cdot H(h,\boldsymbol{s}^{\vee\,\prime})=1$, we obtain the result. ■

9.3 The induced objects

9.3.1 The induced vector bundle ${}^I\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,I)$. We put as follows:

$${}^I\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}:={}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\bigl(\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\bigr).$$

Let $\lambda\in\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ be generic. Let us pick $\epsilon_0'>0$ such that $\Delta(\lambda,\epsilon_0')\subset\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 9.20 *We have the following isomorphism:*

$${}^I\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda,\epsilon_0')}\simeq{}^I\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}.$$

Proof For $\boldsymbol{\omega}=\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})$, we have the following decomposition on $\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:

$$\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\omega}}\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}.$$

Then we obtain the natural isomorphisms:

$${}^I\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda,\epsilon_0')}\simeq{}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\Delta(\lambda,\epsilon_0')}\simeq\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\,|\,\Delta(\lambda,\epsilon_0')}\simeq{}^I\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}.$$

Thus we are done. ■

Due to Lemma 9.20, we obtain the vector bundle ${}^I\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$.

9.3.2 The induced pairing and nilpotent maps

We have the natural pairing: $\mathcal{H}(E)\otimes\mathcal{H}(E^\vee)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}$. Pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ and a sufficiently small positive number $\epsilon_0>0$. On $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we have the filtrations ${}^i\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decompositions ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$, which was preserved by the pairing. Hence we obtain the following induced pairing:

$$S:{}^I\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}(E)\otimes{}^I\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}(E^\vee)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}.$$

The monodromies M_i induces the endomorphisms $M_{i\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ on ${}^I\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}$. We denote the unipotent part by $M^u_{i\,\boldsymbol{u}}$. Then we obtain the following nilpotent maps:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u},i}:=\frac{-1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\log M^u_{i\,\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Lemma 9.21 *We have the relation $S\bigl(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i}\otimes id\bigr)+S\bigl(id\otimes\mathcal{N}_{-\boldsymbol{u}\,i}\bigr)=0$.*

Proof Since the monodromy endomorphisms preserve the pairings, the claim is obtained. ■

9.3.3 Functoriality for the dual

Due to the subsubsection 9.3.2, we obtain the naturally defined morphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H}(E^{\vee})) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})^{\vee}$.

Lemma 9.22 *The morphism* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})(E^{\vee}) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H}(E))^{\vee}$ *is isomorphic.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 9.19. ▮

9.3.4 Functoriality for tensor products

The morphism $\mathcal{H}(E_1) \otimes \mathcal{H}(E_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}(E_1 \otimes E_2)$ preserves the $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. We have the naturally defined morphism:

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}_i \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}),\\ \boldsymbol{u}_1 + \boldsymbol{u}_2 = \boldsymbol{u}}} {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}\mathcal{H}(E_1) \otimes {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}\mathcal{H}(E_2) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2}\mathcal{H}\big(E_1 \otimes E_2\big). \tag{235}$$

Lemma 9.23 *The morphism* (235) *is isomorphic.*

Proof Under the isomorphism $\mathcal{H}(E_1) \otimes \mathcal{H}(E_2) \simeq \mathcal{H}(E_1 \otimes E_2)$, the induced filtration on the left hand side and the filtration on the right hand side are same, due to the result in the case of curves. Then we obtain the lemma. ▮

9.3.5 Functoriality for pull backs

We use the setting in the subsubsection 8.9.6. We have the naturally defined isomorphism $\mathcal{H}(E) \simeq \mathcal{H}(\psi^*(E))$.

Lemma 9.24 *We have the naturally defined isomorphism:*

$$\bigoplus_{\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*(\boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{u}_1} {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\mathcal{H}(E)\big) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}\big(\mathcal{H}(\psi^* E)\big).$$

Here $\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*(\boldsymbol{u})$ *denotes the element whose i-th component is* $c_i \cdot u_i$ *for* $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_l)$.

Proof It is easy to see that the isomorphism is strictly compatible with the filtration $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$. It is also easy to check that the isomorphism is compatible with the decompositions $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. Thus we obtain the isomorphism desired. ▮

10 The filtrations and the decompositions on $\mathcal{E}$ and ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}$

10.1 The filtrations and the decompositions on $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ and ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$

10.1.1 The compatibility of the decompositions

Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a base of $H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, compatible with $\mathbb{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. We put $\boldsymbol{a}_i := \mathbf{deg}^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i)$. We put $v_i := F(s_i, \boldsymbol{a}_i - \boldsymbol{c})$, and then $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ is a tuple of sections of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Lemma 10.1 *The tuple* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *gives a frame of* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. *The restriction of* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *to* $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ *is compatible with the decomposition* ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}$ *and the filtration* ${}^{i}F$ *of the vector bundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\lambda}}$.

Proof We have only to show that $\boldsymbol{v}_{|\pi_j^{-1}(P)}$ gives a frame of ${}_{c_j}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|\pi_j^{-1}(P)}$ for any point $P \in D_j^{\circ}$. Then it follows from the result in the case of curves (the subsubsection 7.4.5). ▮

By the action of monodromies, we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}, \qquad \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,P} = \mathbb{E}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|P},\ \boldsymbol{\omega}\big). \tag{236}$$

Lemma 10.2 *The decomposition* (236) *is prolonged to the decomposition of the vector bundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$*. Namely, we have the following decomposition of* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$*:*

$$ {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}. $$

Proof We have only to use the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ above. ■

Then we obtain the decomposition of the restriction of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}$ to D_i:

$$ {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in \mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda})} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,D_i}. $$

On the other hand, we have the decomposition of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}_{|D_i}$ induced by the action of the residue $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$:

$$ {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i} = \bigoplus_{\beta\in \mathcal{S}p({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)} \mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i},\beta\bigr). $$

The relation of the two decompositions are given in the following lemma.

Lemma 10.3 *We have the following equality:*

$$ \bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,D_i} = \bigoplus_{\beta\in L(\lambda,\omega)} \mathbb{E}({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i},\beta), \tag{237} $$

Here we put $L(\lambda,\omega) := \bigl\{\beta\in\mathcal{S}p({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)\,\big|\,\exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta)=\omega\bigr\}$.

Proof Since the both sides of (237) are vector subbundles of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}$, we have only to show the equality for the fibers over the points $P\in D_i^{\circ}$. Thus we have only to consider the case $\dim(X)=1$. Then it follows from Corollary 7.21. ■

Corollary 10.1 *Let* I *be a subset of* $\underline{l}$*. Let* $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\circ}=(\omega_i^{\circ}\,|\,i\in I)$ *be an element of* $\mathcal{S}p^{f}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)$*. Then we have the following:*

$$ \bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega_i^{\circ}} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,D_I} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in L(\lambda,\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\circ})} \mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_I},\boldsymbol{\beta}\bigr). $$

Here we put $L(\lambda,\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\circ}) := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{S}p({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},I)\,\big|\,\exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta_i\bigr)=\omega_i^{\circ}\ (i\in I)\bigr\}$. ■

10.1.2 The compatibility of the filtrations

We have the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ induced by the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)\bigr)$ of $\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)$.

Proposition 10.1

- *The vector subbundle* ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}_b\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)$ *of* $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ *can be prolonged to the subbundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}_b\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)$ *of* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$*.*
- *The family* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)=\bigl\{{}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}_a\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)\,\big|\,a\in\boldsymbol{R}\bigr\}$ *gives the filtration of the vector bundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ *in the category of vector bundles.*
- *The tuple of the filtrations* $\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)\,\big|\,i=1,\ldots,l\bigr)$ *of the vector bundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ *is compatible.*

Proof It is easy to check the claims by using the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ given in the first part of the subsubsection 10.1.1. ■

Then we have the filtrations ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)_{|D_i}$ of the vector bundle ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}$. On the other hand, we have the parabolic filtration ${}^{i}F$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i}$. The relation of two filtrations are given in the proposition 10.2

We recall that the number $\alpha(a,\omega)\in\boldsymbol{C}$ for $(a,\omega)\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ is determined by the following conditions:

$$ \exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\cdot\alpha(a,\omega)\bigr)=\omega,\qquad a\leq\mathrm{Re}\bigl(\alpha(a,\omega)\bigr)<a+1. $$

We put $d(a,\omega):=a-\mathrm{Re}(\alpha(a,\omega))\in\boldsymbol{R}$.

Proposition 10.2 *We have the following equality:*

$$\bigoplus_{q_i(\boldsymbol{\omega})=\omega} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}_b\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)_{|D_i} = {}^{i}F_{d(b-c_i,\omega)}\Bigl(\mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i},\lambda\cdot\alpha(b-c_i,\omega)\bigr)\Bigr)\oplus\bigoplus_{\beta\in K(\lambda,\omega,b)}\mathbb{E}\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|D_i},\beta\bigr).$$

Here we put $K(\lambda,\omega,b):=\bigl\{\beta\in\mathcal{S}p(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},i)\bigm|\exp\bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta\bigr)=\omega,\ \mathrm{Re}\bigl(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\beta\bigr)<\mathrm{Re}\bigl(\alpha(b-c_i,\omega)\bigr)\bigr\}$.

Proof The claim can be easily reduced to the case $\dim(X)=1$, as in the proof of Lemma 10.3. ∎

10.1.3 The induced vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$. We put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{b}:=\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}),\quad \boldsymbol{\omega}:=\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}),\quad \boldsymbol{c}:=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}).$$

We obtain the holomorphic vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ over X, given as follows:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr):=\frac{{}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}'\lneq\boldsymbol{b}}{}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\bigr)}.$$

Lemma 10.4 *We have the natural isomorphism:*

$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)_{|D_{\underline{l}}}\simeq{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times D_{\underline{l}}}.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 10.3, Proposition 10.2 and the definitions. ∎

We have the induced λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$, which is flat and regular. Then we obtain the residues $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$.

Corollary 10.2 *The endomorphism* $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ *has the unique eigenvalue* $\mathfrak{e}\bigl(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$. ∎

Let $H\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr)$ be the space of the multi-valued flat sections of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$. Naturally we have the following isomorphism:

$$H\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})\bigr)\simeq{}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\,\mathbb{E}\bigl(H(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}),\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr)=\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{H}\bigr)_{|\lambda}.$$

10.2 The decomposition $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the filtration $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\mathcal{E}$ for $\lambda_0\neq 0$

10.2.1 Prolongation of the decompositions and the filtrations

The decomposition $\mathcal{H}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda_0})}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ and the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$ on $\mathcal{H}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ induce those on $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. Namely, we have the decomposition $\mathcal{E}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\in\mathcal{S}p(\boldsymbol{M}^{\lambda_0})}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ and the filtration ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}})$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that $b_i\notin\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$. If ϵ_0 is sufficiently small, we have the locally free sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Proposition 10.3

1. *The vector subbundle* ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ *of* $\mathcal{E}$ *is prolonged to the subbundle* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ *of* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ *on* $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.
2. *We have* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}}={}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. *On the other hand, we have the following decomposition, for any* $\lambda\in\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:

$${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega})}{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}.$$

Here we put $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}):=\bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})\bigm|\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr\}$.

3. *We have* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}} = {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)$. *On the other hand, we have the decomposition, for any* $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$*:*
$${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{c}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}\,|\,\lambda} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega},b,i)} {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u}))}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}\big) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega},b,i)} {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})}.$$
Here we put $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, b, i) := \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{\omega},\ \mathfrak{p}^f\big(\lambda_0, q_i(\boldsymbol{u})\big) \leq b\big\}$.

4. *The tuple of the filtrations* $\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, l\big)$ *is compatible.*

Proof Once we know the claim 1, then the rests follow from the result at the specializations (Lemma 10.3, Proposition 10.1 and Proposition 10.2). Hence we have only to check the claim 1. We may assume that $\boldsymbol{b} = 0$.

Lemma 10.5 *Let* $\epsilon_i > 0$ *be positive numbers such that* $\mathrm{rank}(E) \cdot \epsilon_i < 1$. *Assume that* $\mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, i)$ *are* ϵ_i*-small for any* $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. *Then the filtration* ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ *can be prolonged to the subbundle of* ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ *over* $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_i)$.

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $\mathcal{H}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$. We put $R := \mathrm{rank}\big({}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\big(\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)\big)$. Due to the assumption of Lemma 10.5, we have $\bigwedge^R({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}) = \Big({}^{\diamond}\bigwedge^R \mathcal{E}\Big)$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

From the frame $\boldsymbol{s}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we obtain the naturally induced frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}} = (\tilde{s}_j)$ of $\bigwedge^R \mathcal{H}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$. There exists j_0 such that $\tilde{s}_{j_0}$ gives a frame of the line bundle $\bigwedge^R\big({}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\mathcal{H}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)$.

There exists $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in \mathcal{KMS}\big({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}\big)$ such that $\mathbf{deg}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(\tilde{s}_{j_0}) = \mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$. We have the following:
$$\boldsymbol{u}_0 = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega},a,i)} \boldsymbol{u}, \quad \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, a, i) := \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{\omega},\ \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0, q_i(\boldsymbol{u})) \leq a\big\}.$$

We put as follows: $v = \exp\Big(\log z \cdot \big(\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}_0) + \nu\big(\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}_0)\big)\big)\Big) \cdot \tilde{s}_{j_0}$. Then v is a section of ${}^{\diamond}\Big(\bigwedge^R \mathcal{E}\Big)$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. It is easy to see that Lemma 10.5 can be reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 10.6 *There exists* $\eta > 0$ *and a neighbourhood* U *of* O *in* X*, such that* $v_{|(\lambda,P)} \neq 0$ *for any* $(\lambda, P) \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \eta) \times U$.

Proof The section $v_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}}$ gives an element of the frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}$ induced by $\tilde{s}$, as in the subsubsection 10.1.1. Then we obtain Lemma 10.6 and Lemma 10.5. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 10.3. Note the following: We can pick $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^l_{>0}$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that ${}^{\diamond}\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E} \otimes L(\boldsymbol{u})$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 10.5 on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Hence $\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\big({}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big)$ can be prolonged to the $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}$-equivariant subbundle of ${}^{\diamond}\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}$. Then we pick the equivariant frame, and take the descent of the frame. (See the argument in the subsubsection 8.6.3). Then it follows that ${}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ can be prolonged to the subbundle of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$. Thus we obtain the claim 1 of Proposition 10.3. ∎

10.2.2 The induced bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$. Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}$. We put $(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) = \mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u})$. Pick a sufficiently small $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that $c_i = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_i) + \epsilon' \not\in \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ for any i and for any $0 < \epsilon' \leq \epsilon$. We put $\boldsymbol{c}' = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) + \epsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}$. Pick sufficiently small ϵ_0. Then we have the following vector bundle over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:
$${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}) := {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\big).$$

The following lemma is clear from our construction.

Lemma 10.7 *It is independent of a choice of* ϵ *on a neighbourhood of* λ_0. ∎

We may assume that any point $\lambda \in \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_i)$ is generic. Pick a positive number ϵ_0' such that $\Delta(\lambda, \epsilon_0') \subset \Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. We may assume that we have the vector bundle $\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda, \epsilon_0')$.

Lemma 10.8 *We have the following natural isomorphism:*

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda,\epsilon_0')} \simeq \mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof We have the following decomposition:

$${}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda,\epsilon_0')} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}'\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega})} {}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda)}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}')}, \quad \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}' \in \overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l}) \bigm| \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}') = \boldsymbol{\omega}\bigr\}.$$

We have the following isomorphism:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{E})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda,\epsilon_0')} \simeq {}^{l}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda,\epsilon_0')} \simeq {}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda)}_{\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})} \simeq \mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Hence we are done. ▮

Hence we obtain the vector bundle ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^* \times X$, and the induced regular λ-connection $\mathbb{D}$ on ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Lemma 10.9 *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$.*

- *We have the following isomorphism:*

$$\bigl({}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}},\ \mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})\bigr) \simeq \bigl({}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}},\ \mathcal{N}_i + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)\bigr).$$

- *Taking the multi-valued flat sections of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$, we obtain the vector bundle ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$.*

Proof It immediately follows from our construction. ▮

10.2.3 Pairing

From the natural pairing $\mathcal{E}\otimes\mathcal{E}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$, we obtain the following morphism on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ for $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ and for any sufficiently small $\epsilon_0>0$:

$${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}\bigr)\otimes{}_{-\boldsymbol{b}+(1-\epsilon)\boldsymbol{\delta}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\vee\bigr) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Since it preserves the filtrations $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decompositions $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$, we obtain the following morphism of regular λ-connections:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{E}\otimes\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{E}^\vee \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

10.2.4 Functoriality

We have the naturally defined morphism ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\vee\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}\bigr)^\vee$. We also have the morphism ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\mathcal{E}_1)\otimes{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}(\mathcal{E}_2) \longrightarrow {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2}(\mathcal{E}_1\otimes\mathcal{E}_2)$.

Lemma 10.10 *The morphism ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^\vee\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}\bigr)^\vee$ is isomorphic. The following morphism is isomorphic:*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}_i\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}_1}\mathcal{E}_i),\\ \boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2=\boldsymbol{u}}} {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\mathcal{E}_1)\otimes{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}(\mathcal{E}_2) \longrightarrow {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2}(\mathcal{E}_1\otimes\mathcal{E}_2).$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 9.22 and Lemma 9.23. ▮

We also have the functoriality for the pull backs. We use the setting in the subsubsection 8.9.6.

Lemma 10.11 *We have the naturally defined isomorphism as follows:*

$$\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_1} {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}) \simeq {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\psi^*\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 9.24. ▮

10.3 The morphisms between ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}$

10.3.1 The induced morphism $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$

From the regular λ-connection $\bigl({}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}),\mathbb{D}\bigr)$, we obtain the isomorphism $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}:{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}\longrightarrow {}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}}$, which we will explain. For any holomorphic section s of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H})$ over an open subset $U\subset \boldsymbol{C}^*$, we put as follows:

$$v=\exp\Bigl(\sum_{j}\log z_j\cdot\bigl(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_j)+\mathcal{N}_{j\,\boldsymbol{u}}\bigr)\Bigr)\cdot s.$$

Then it gives the holomorphic section of the vector bundle ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\bigl(\mathcal{E}\bigr)$ over $U\times X$. Then the restriction $v_{|U\times\{O\}}$ is a section of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ over U. We put $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(s):=v_{|U\times\{O\}}$, and then we obtain the isomorphism $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ desired.

The morphism $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ be also seen as follows: Let s be a section of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}$. We have the expression as follows:

$$s=\exp\Bigl(-\sum_{j}\log z_j\cdot\bigl(\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_j)+\mathcal{N}_{j,\boldsymbol{u}}\bigr)\Bigr)\cdot v=\sum_{J}(\log z)^{J}\cdot v_J.$$

Here $J=(j_1,\ldots,j_l)$ denotes multi-indices and $\bigl(\log z\bigr)^{J}=\prod_{h=1}^{l}\bigl(\log z_h\bigr)^{j_h}$.

Lemma 10.12 *We have* $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(s)=v_0(O)$.

Proof It immediately follows from our construction. ∎

Lemma 10.13 *The isomorphism* $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ *preserves the morphisms* $\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i}$ *and the pairing. It is compatible with tensor products and duals. It is also compatible with pull backs as in the subsubsection* 8.9.6.

Proof It is clear from our construction. ∎

10.3.2 The induced morphisms $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,O}$

For any point $P\in X$, we have the isomorphisms of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*\times\{P\}}$. For simplicity of notation, we denote ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*\times\{P\}}$ by ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|P}$.

Take a normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$, namely we take a holomorphic frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\sum A_i\frac{dz_i}{z_i}$ holds for some constant matrices A_i. For any point $P,Q\in X$, the trivialization $\boldsymbol{v}$ gives the isomorphism $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,Q}:{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|P}\longrightarrow{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|Q}$, by the correspondence $v_{i\,|\,P}\longmapsto v_{i\,|\,Q}$. If we fix the coordinate, the $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,Q}$ does not depend on a choice of normalizing frame. Note that we have the isomorphism:

$${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|O}\simeq{}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*}.$$

Thus we obtain the isomorphism $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,O}$ of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|P}$ and ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

Lemma 10.14 *The isomorphism* $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,O}$ *preserves the morphisms* $\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i}$ *and the pairing. It is compatible with tensor product and dual. It is also compatible with pull backs as in the subsubsection* 8.9.6. ∎

Remark 10.1 *In our previous paper* [38], *we used only the morphism* $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u},P,O}$ *and did not use the morphism* $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. ∎

Part III

Limiting mixed twistor theorem and some consequence

11 The induced vector bundle

11.1 The variation of pure twistor structures

11.1.1 Conjugate

Let X be a complex manifold. We denote the conjugate of X by $X^{\dagger}$. We put $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}=\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}\times X^{\dagger}$. Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over X. Then we obtain the tame harmonic bundle $(E,\partial_E,h,\theta^{\dagger})$ over $X^{\dagger}$, and thus the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}-\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}$ and the μ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}$. We also have the associated flat connections $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}$.

Let $\sigma:\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ be the morphism given by $\mu\longmapsto-\overline{\mu}$. It induces the anti-holomorphic map $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}\longrightarrow\mathcal{X}$.

Let U be an open subset of $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}$. We have the isomorphism $\sigma:U\longrightarrow\sigma(U)$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\sigma(U)$. Then we put as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}:=\sigma^{*}\Bigl(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v})}^{-1}\Bigr). \tag{238}$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ is a tuple of C^{∞}-sections of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ on U.

Lemma 11.1

1. *The tuple $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ is a holomorphic frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ on U.*
2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the λ-connection one form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$. Then the μ-connection one form of $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ is given by $\sigma^{*}\Bigl({}^{t}\overline{\mathcal{A}}\Bigr)$.*

Proof It can be checked by direct calculations. (See the subsubsection 3.1.6 in our previous paper [38], for example). ∎

11.1.2 The comparison of the flat connections

We identify $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}^{*}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$ by the relation $\mu=\lambda^{-1}$. It induces the identification of the C^{∞}-manifolds $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\sharp}=\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}$.

We have the holomorphic family of the flat connections $(\mathcal{E}^{\sharp},\mathbb{D}^{f})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}-\mathcal{D}^{\sharp}$. We also have the holomorphic family of the flat connections $(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,\sharp},\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp\,\dagger}-\mathcal{D}^{\sharp\,\dagger}$.

Lemma 11.2 *Under the identification $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\sharp}=\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}$ given above, we have $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,\sharp},\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}\bigr)=\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\sharp},\mathbb{D}^{f}\bigr)$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}$.*

Proof By definition of $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}$, we obtain the following:

$$\mathbb{D}^{f}=\overline{\partial}_E+\lambda\theta^{\dagger}+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\Bigl(\lambda\partial_E+\theta\Bigr)=\partial_E+\mu\theta+\mu^{-1}\Bigl(\mu\cdot\overline{\partial}_E+\theta^{\dagger}\Bigr)=\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}.$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Let M_i denote the monodromy endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}$ with respect to the loop γ_i around the divisor D_i with the anti-clockwise direction:

$$\gamma_i:[0,1]\longrightarrow\bigl(z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1},e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}t}\cdot z_i,z_{i+1},\ldots,z_n\bigr). \tag{239}$$

Let $M_i^{\dagger}$ denote the monodromy endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ of γ_i^{-1}. The following lemma immediately follows from Lemma 11.2.

Lemma 11.3 *We have $M_i^{-1}=M_i^{\dagger}$.* ∎

11.1.3 The variation of pure twistor structures and the conjugate

Due to Lemma 11.2, we obtain the patched object as in the subsubsection 3.5.2. Thus we obtain the variation of pure twistor structures. It can be simply described as follows: Let $p : X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \longrightarrow X$ denote the projection. We put $\mathcal{E}^{\triangle} := p^{-1}(E)$. The differential operator $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle} : C^{\infty}\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{E}^{\triangle}\bigr) \longrightarrow C^{\infty}\bigl(X \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{E}^{\triangle} \otimes \xi\Omega^1_X\bigr)$ is given as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\triangle} := \bigl(\overline{\partial}_E + \theta\bigr) \otimes \sqrt{-1} \cdot f_0^{(1)} + \bigl(\partial_E + \theta^{\dagger}\bigr) \otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}.$$

Lemma 11.4 $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}, \mathbb{D}^{\triangle}\bigr)$ *is a variation of pure twistor structures.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation (Lemma 3.33). ▮

We obtain the conjugate $\bigl(\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}, \mathbb{D}^{\triangle}_{\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}}\bigr)$ (see the subsubsection 3.5.4). In this case, we have $\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle} = p^{-1}(E)$.

Lemma 11.5 *The $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic structure d''_{λ} is given as follows:*

$$d''_{\lambda}\sigma^* g = \sigma^*\Bigl(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{\lambda}}\Bigr) \cdot (-d\bar{\lambda}).$$

Proof By definition, we have the following:

$$d''_{\lambda}\sigma^* g = \varphi_0 \sigma^*\bigl(\overline{\partial}_{\lambda} g\bigr) = \sigma^*\Bigl(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{\lambda}}\Bigr) \cdot (-d\bar{\lambda}).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Lemma 11.6 *Let g be a section of $\mathcal{E}$. The C^{∞}-sections A_i, B_i, C_i and D_i are determined as follows:*

$$\partial_E g = \sum A_i \cdot dz_i, \quad \theta^{\dagger} \cdot g = \sum B_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i, \quad \overline{\partial}_E g = \sum C_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i, \quad \theta \cdot g = \sum D_i \cdot dz_i.$$

Then we have the following formula:

$$\mathbb{D}(\sigma^* g) = \sum_i \Bigl(\sigma^* A_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} f_0^{(1)} - \sigma^* B_i \cdot dz_i \otimes \sqrt{-1} f_0^{(1)} + \sigma^* C_i \cdot dz_i \otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)} - \sigma^* D_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i \otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}\Bigr). \quad (240)$$

Proof We have $\mathbb{D}(\sigma^* g) = \varphi_0 \sigma^*(\mathbb{D} g)$ by definition. We can check the formula (240) by using Lemma 3.37. ▮

11.1.4 Polarization

For any sections f and $\sigma^*(g)$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}$ and $\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}$, we have the C^{∞}-function $S\bigl(f, \sigma^*(g)\bigr) := h\bigl(f(\lambda, x), g(-\bar{\lambda}, x)\bigr)$ Thus we obtain the pairing $S : \mathcal{E}^{\triangle} \otimes \sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$.

Lemma 11.7 *The pairing S is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^1$-holomorphic bundles.*

Proof We have the following equality:

$$\overline{\partial}_{\lambda} S(f, \sigma^* g) = h\bigl(\overline{\partial}_{\lambda} f(\lambda, x), g(-\bar{\lambda}, x)\bigr) + h\bigl(f(\lambda, x), \partial_{\lambda}\bigl(g(-\bar{\lambda}, x)\bigr)\bigr).$$

The first term in the right hand side can be rewritten as $S\bigl(\overline{\partial}_{\lambda} f, \sigma^* g\bigr)$. The second term in the right hand side can be rewritten as follows:

$$h\Bigl(f(\lambda, x), \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{\lambda}}(-\bar{\lambda}, x)\Bigr) \cdot (-d\bar{\lambda}) = S\Bigl(f, \sigma^* \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{\lambda}}\Bigr)(-d\bar{\lambda}) = S\Bigl(f, d''\sigma^* g\Bigr).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Lemma 11.8 *The pairing S is a morphism of variation of pure twistors.*

Proof We have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\partial}_X S\bigl(f,\sigma^*g\bigr)\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)} &= h\bigl(\overline{\partial}_E f(\lambda,x),g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}+h\bigl(f(\lambda,x),\partial_E g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}\\ &= h\bigl((\overline{\partial}_E+\theta)f(\lambda,x),g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}+h\bigl(f(\lambda,x),(\partial_E-\theta^{\dagger})g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}\\ &= S\bigl((\overline{\partial}_E+\theta)f,\sigma^*g\bigr)+\sum_i S(f,\sigma^*A_i)\cdot d\bar{z}_i\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_0^{(1)}-\sum_i S(f,\sigma^*B_i)\cdot dz_i\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_0^{(1)}. \end{aligned}\tag{241}$$

Here we have used Lemma 11.6. On the other hand, we also have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_X S\bigl(f,\sigma^*g\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(1)} &= h\bigl(\partial_E f,g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}+h\bigl(f,\overline{\partial}_E g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}\\ &= h\bigl((\partial_E+\theta^{\dagger})f,g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}+h\bigl(f,(\overline{\partial}_E-\theta)g(-\bar{\lambda},x)\bigr)\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}\\ &= S\bigl((\partial_E+\theta^{\dagger})f,\sigma^*g\bigr)+\sum_i S\bigl(f,\sigma^*C_i\bigr)\cdot d\bar{z}_i\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}-\sum_i S\bigl(f,\sigma^*D_j\bigr)\cdot dz_j\otimes f_\infty^{(1)}. \end{aligned}\tag{242}$$

Then Lemma 11.8 immediately follows. ∎

Corollary 11.1 (Simpson) *The tuple $(\mathcal{E}^{\triangle},\mathbb{D}^{\triangle},h)$ is a variation of polarized pure twistor structures.* ∎

Lemma 11.9 *We obtain the isomorphism $\clubsuit:\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\triangle}\simeq\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\triangle}$ of the variation of pure twistors. In particular, we obtain the isomorphisms $\sigma^*\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}\simeq\mathcal{E}^{\vee}$ and $\sigma^*\mathcal{E}\simeq\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\dagger}$. We also denote them by $\clubsuit$.*

Proof Since the pairing S is perfect, it induces the isomorphism $\clubsuit$. ∎

11.2 The induced objects of the conjugate and the pairing

11.2.1 Compatible frame and the KMS-structure of the conjugate

We put $X=\Delta^n$, $D_i:=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}D_i$. Let us pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. Let us pick a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0 such that the sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is locally free. Let $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$. For each v_i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$ such that the following holds:

$$\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}(v_i))=\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},\underline{l}).$$

Let $u_j(v_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,j)$ denote the j-th component of $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)$.

We denote the restriction $\boldsymbol{v}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ by $\boldsymbol{v}$, for simplicity. Then we obtain the holomorphic frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is given by (238). (Note $\sigma(\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0))=\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.) We put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &v_i':=v_i\cdot\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^{l}|z_j|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_j(v_i))}, &&\boldsymbol{v}':=\bigl(v_i'\bigr),\\ &v_i^{\dagger\,\prime}:=v_i^{\dagger}\cdot\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^{l}|z_j|^{-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_j(v_i))}, &&\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}=\bigl(v_i^{\dagger\,\prime}\bigr). \end{aligned}\tag{243}$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is a C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, and $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}$ is a C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ over $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)-\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 11.10 *The frames $\boldsymbol{v}'$ and $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}$ are adapted up to log order.*

Proof The adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ up to log order has already been shown in Proposition 8.7 (the subsubsection 8.8.5). Let L be the diagonal matrix such that $L_{i\,i}:=\prod_j|z_j|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_j(v_i))}$. Then we have the relations $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}=\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}\cdot L^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}'=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot L$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}=\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}\cdot L^{-1}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v})}^{-1}\cdot L^{-1}=\boldsymbol{v}'\cdot L^{-1}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v})}^{-1}\cdot L^{-1}=\boldsymbol{v}'\cdot\overline{(L\cdot H(h,\boldsymbol{v})\cdot L)}^{-1}=\boldsymbol{v}'\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')}^{-1}.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted up to log order, and since $H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')$ and $H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')^{-1}$ is bounded up to log order, $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,\prime}$ is adapted up to log order. ∎

Recall that we put $\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}:=(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}},-\boldsymbol{b})$, for any element $\boldsymbol{u}=(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{b})\in\boldsymbol{C}^l\times\boldsymbol{R}^l$ (the subsubsection 2.1.6).

Corollary 11.2

- *There exists a positive number* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that* $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ *is a frame of* ${}_{-\boldsymbol{b}+(1-\epsilon)\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ *over* $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0, \epsilon_0)$.
- *The frame* $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ *is compatible with the parabolic filtration* $F^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}$ *and the decomposition* $\mathbb{E}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}$.
- *We have the following:*
$$\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}, F^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}}(v_i^{\dagger}) = \mathfrak{k}(-\overline{\lambda_0}, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)^{\dagger}).$$

Proof By using Lemma 2.4, we obtain the first claim. By using Lemma 2.5, we obtain that the frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ is compatible with the filtration $F^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}$, and we have the following:

$$\deg^{F^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}}(v_i^{\dagger}) = -\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)) = \mathfrak{p}\big(-\overline{\lambda}_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)^{\dagger}\big).$$

Here we have used Lemma 2.2.

Due to the claim 2 in Lemma 11.1, we obtain that the frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}$ is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}$. Moreover we have the following:
$$\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0)}}(v_i) = \overline{\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\big)} = \mathfrak{e}\big(-\overline{\lambda}_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)^{\dagger}\big).$$

Thus we obtain the second and the third claims in Corollary 11.2. ▌

Corollary 11.3 *By the correspondence* $\boldsymbol{u} \longmapsto \boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}$, *we have the isomorphism preserving the multiplicity:*

$$\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \underline{l}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,-\bar{\lambda}}, \underline{l}).$$

In particular, we have the isomorphism $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{0}, \underline{l}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,0}, \underline{l})$. ▌

Lemma 11.11 *Via the isomorphism* $\clubsuit : \sigma^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger} \simeq \mathcal{E}^{\vee}$, *we have* $\clubsuit(\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger}) = \boldsymbol{v}^{\vee}$.

Proof It can be shown by an elementary linear algebraic argument. (See the subsubsection 3.1.6 in the previous paper, for example.) ▌

11.2.2 The conjugate and the dual

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$. Let $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{l}$ such that $b_i \notin \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\vee\,\lambda_0}, i)$ for any i. We take a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0, then we have the locally free sheaf ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Corollary 11.4 *The sheaf* ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ *on* $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0, \epsilon_0)$ *is locally free. We have the isomorphism* $\clubsuit : \sigma^{*}\big({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}\big) \simeq {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}$.

Proof It follows from Lemma 11.11. ▌

The morphism $\clubsuit$ induces the isomorphism $\clubsuit_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$:

$$\clubsuit_{|D_i} : \sigma^{*}{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(-\bar{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)} \longrightarrow {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}.$$

Recall that we have the decomposition ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the filtration ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(-\bar{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)}$ given in the subsubsection 8.8.1 and the subsubsection 8.8.4. Similarly, we have the decomposition and the filtration of $\sigma^{*}{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$.

Lemma 11.12 *The morphism* $\clubsuit_{|D_i}$ *preserves the filtrations and the decompositions. In particular, the morphism* $\clubsuit_{|D_i}$ *induces the isomorphism* $\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger,-\overline{\lambda}}, i) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee,\lambda}, i)$ *given by the correspondence* $(\alpha, a) \longmapsto (-\overline{\alpha}, a)$.

Proof It can be shown by using the comparison of $\deg^{\mathbb{E},F}(v_i^{\dagger})$ and $\deg^{\mathbb{E},F}(v_i^{\vee})$. ▌

Remark 11.1 When we have $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(-\bar{\lambda}_0)}}(v_i^{\dagger})=\alpha$, we obtain $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(\sigma^*(v_i^{\dagger}))=-\overline{\alpha}$, due to the relation $\clubsuit(v_i^{\dagger})=v_i^{\vee}$. It can be directly seen, which we explain in the following. For simplicity, we assume that $\dim(X)=1$ and that we have the equality $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger}v_i^{\dagger}=\alpha\cdot v_i^{\dagger}\cdot d\bar{z}/\bar{z}$. In that case, we have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}(v_i^{\dagger})=\alpha\cdot v_i^{\dagger}\cdot d\bar{z}/\bar{z}\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}.$$

Then we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}\sigma^*(v_i^{\dagger})=\varphi_0\sigma^*\bigl(\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}v_i^{\dagger}\bigr)=\varphi_0\sigma^*\bigl(\alpha\cdot v_i^{\dagger}\cdot d\bar{z}/\bar{z}\otimes f_{\infty}^{(1)}\bigr)&=\overline{\alpha}\cdot\sigma^*(v_i^{\dagger})\cdot dz/z\otimes(-\sqrt{-1})\cdot f_0^{(1)}\\&=-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\sigma^*(v_i^{\dagger})\cdot dz/z\otimes\sqrt{-1}\cdot f_0^{(1)}.\end{aligned}\tag{244}$$

Since we have $\mathbb{D}^{\triangle}(\sigma^*v_i^{\dagger})=\mathbb{D}(\sigma^*v_i^{\dagger})\otimes\sqrt{-1}f_0^{(1)}$, we obtain $\mathbb{D}(\sigma^*v_i^{\dagger})=-\overline{\alpha}\cdot\sigma^*(v_i)\cdot dz/z$. ▮

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*$. Then we have the filtration and the decomposition of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\vee}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, given in the subsubsection 10.2.1. Similarly, we have the filtration and the decomposition of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 11.13 *The filtrations and the decompositions are preserved by the morphism* $\clubsuit$.

Proof Recall that the decompositions are induced by the monodromy endomorphisms. Since the $\clubsuit$ preserves the flat connection, the decompositions are preserved.

Recall that the restriction of the filtrations to $\mathcal{X}^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ have the canonical splittings, given by the generalized eigenspaces of the monodromy actions. (Here we may assume that any point λ of $\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is generic.) Thus the restriction of the filtrations to $\mathcal{X}^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ are preserved. Then it follows that the filtrations are preserved on whole $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. ▮

The isomorphism $\clubsuit$ induces the isomorphism $\sigma^*\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}\simeq\mathcal{H}^{\vee}$, which we denote also by $\clubsuit$. Let us pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0. Then we have the filtrations and the decompositions of $\mathcal{H}^{\vee}$ on $\Delta_{\lambda}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, given in the subsubsections 9.1.1–9.1.2. Similarly, we have the filtrations and the decompositions of $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ on $\Delta_{\mu}(-\overline{\lambda}_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 11.14 *The morphism* $\clubsuit$ *preserves the filtrations and the decompositions.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to Lemma 11.13. ▮

11.2.3 The induced objects and the pairing

Let $\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,0},\underline{l})$.

- By applying the constructions in the subsubsection 8.9.1, we obtain the vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}$ on $\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\underline{l}}$. We also have the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^{\dagger})$ and the nilpotent parts $\mathcal{N}_i^{\dagger}$ $(i\in\underline{l})$.
- By applying the construction in the subsubsection 9.3.1, we obtain the holomorphic vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_{\mu}^*$. We also have the monodromy endomorphisms, and the nilpotent parts $\mathcal{N}_i^{\dagger}$.
- By applying the construction in the subsubsection 10.2.2, we obtain the holomorphic vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\sharp}$. We have the holomorphic family of the flat connections $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}$.

Corollary 11.5 *The morphism* $\clubsuit$ *induces the following isomorphisms:*

$$\sigma^*\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}(E)\simeq{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^{\vee}),\quad\sigma^*\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}(E)\simeq{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}(E^{\vee}),\quad\sigma^*\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger})\simeq{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}^{\vee}).$$

In the first and the second isomorphisms, the isomorphisms reverse the signature of the nilpotent maps. In the third isomorphism, the isomorphism preserves the family of the flat connections.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 11.12, Lemma 11.13 and Lemma 11.14. (See also Remark 11.1.) ▮

Corollary 11.6 *We have the naturally defined pairings:*

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \sigma^{*}\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}},
$$

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H} \otimes \sigma^{*}\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}\mathcal{H}^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}},
$$

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}) \otimes \sigma^{*}\,{}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\dagger}}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}}.
$$

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 11.5. ∎

11.3 The induced vector bundles over $\mathbb{P}^1$

11.3.1 The identification of the flat bundles with filtrations and the decompositions

Let M_i denote the monodromy endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}$ with respect to the loop γ_i around the divisor D_i with the anti-clockwise direction:

$$
\gamma_i : [0,1] \longrightarrow \big(z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}, e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}t} \cdot z_i, z_{i+1}, \ldots, z_n\big). \tag{245}
$$

Let $M_i^{\dagger}$ denote the monodromy endomorphism of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ of γ_i^{-1}. Recall Lemma 11.3.

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$ and a small neighbourhood $U \subset \boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$ of λ_0. Then we have the filtration and the decomposition of $\mathcal{E}$ on $U \times X$, given in the subsubsection 10.2.1. We have the point $\lambda_0^{-1} \in \boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\mu}$ and the neighbourhood U' in $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\mu}$, which is same as U by the identification $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$. Then we have the filtration and the decomposition of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ on $X^{\dagger} \times \sigma(U)$ similarly. As is noted in the subsubsection 11.1.2, we have $\big(\mathcal{E}^{\sharp}, \mathbb{D}^{f}\big) = \big(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,\sharp}, \mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}\big)$ as flat bundles.

Corollary 11.7 *The identification $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,\sharp} = \mathcal{E}^{\sharp}$ on $X \times U$ preserves the filtrations and the decompositions.*

Proof The decomposition is obtained from the generalized eigen decomposition of the monodromy endomorphisms. Thus the decompositions are preserved, due to Lemma 11.3. We put $U^{*} = U - \{\lambda_0\}$. We recall that the restriction of the filtrations to $(X - D) \times U^{*}$ have the splittings given by the generalized eigen decompositions as in (220). We also recall the relation $\mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda, u) = \mathfrak{p}^{f}(\lambda^{-1}, u^{\dagger})$ (Lemma 2.3). Then we obtain that the restriction of the filtrations to $(X - D) \times U$ are preserved due to Lemma 11.3. Then it follows that the filtrations are preserved. ∎

By considering the spaces of the multi-valued flat sections, we obtain the vector bundle $\mathcal{H}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta^{\dagger}, h)$ on $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\mu}$. We denote it by $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}(E)$ for simplicity. Namely, $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}_{|\mu}$ denotes the space of the multi-valued flat sections of $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,\mu}$. We have the monodromy endomorphisms $M_i^{\dagger}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ with respect to the loop γ_i^{-1}. We also have the monodromy endomorphisms M_i of $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to the loop γ_i.

Lemma 11.15 *Under the identification $\boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\mu} = \boldsymbol{C}^{*}_{\lambda}$ above, we have $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}(E) = \mathcal{H}(E)$. We have $M_i^{-1} = M_i^{\dagger}$.*

Proof It follows from the coincidence of the flat connections $\mathbb{D}^{\mu,f} = \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$. ∎

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and an appropriate neighbourhood U of λ_0. Then we have the filtrations and the decompositions of $\mathcal{H}$ on U, given in the subsubsections 9.1.1–9.1.2. Similarly, we have the filtrations and the decompositions of $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ on U.

Corollary 11.8 *The identification $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$ preserves the filtrations and the decompositions.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Corollary 11.7. ∎

11.3.2 The identification of the induced objects

We have the holomorphic bundles ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$. We have the tuple of the monodromy endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{M} = (M_1, \ldots, M_l)$. Here M_i denote the monodromy along the loop γ_i given in (245). We also have the holomorphic bundles ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$. We have the tuple of the monodromy endomorphisms $\boldsymbol{M}^\dagger = (M_1^\dagger, \ldots, M_l^\dagger)$. Here $M_i^\dagger$ denotes the monodromy along the loop γ_i^{-1}.

We identify $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$ by the relation $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$.

Lemma 11.16 *We have the natural identification* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H} = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}\mathcal{H}$. *We also have* $M^{-1} = M^\dagger$.

Proof Due to Lemma 11.15, we have the natural identification $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^\dagger$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$, on which we have $M^{-1} = M^\dagger$. Due to Corollary 11.8 and Lemma 2.3, we obtain the result. ▮

We have the holomorphic vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X}^\sharp$. We denote the restriction of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ to $\mathcal{X}^\sharp - \mathcal{D}^\sharp$ by the same notation. Then we have the holomorphic family of the regular connections $\mathbb{D}^f$.

Similarly, we also have the C^∞-bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ with the holomorphic family of the flat connections $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger f}$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\sharp} - \mathcal{D}^{\dagger\,\sharp}$. By the relation $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$, we have $\mathcal{X}^\sharp - \mathcal{D}^\sharp = \mathcal{X}^{\dagger\,\sharp} - \mathcal{D}^{\dagger\,\sharp} = (X - D) \times \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$.

Lemma 11.17 *We have the natural identification* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger) = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ *and* $\mathbb{D}^f = \mathbb{D}^{\dagger f}$ *on* $\mathcal{X}^\sharp - \mathcal{D}^\sharp$.

Proof Recall Lemma 11.2 and Corollary 11.7. Then Lemma 11.17 can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 11.16. ▮

11.3.3 The vector bundle $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P)$

Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$. Then we obtain the holomorphic vector bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$. For simplicity, we denote the restriction of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ to $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{O\}$ by the same notation. Namely, we have the holomorphic bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \simeq \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{O\}$. Similarly, we have the holomorphic bundle ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$.

Let P be a point of $X - D$. Then we have the isomorphism $\Phi_{P,O} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})_{|\{P\}\times \boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda$, given in the subsubsection 10.3.2. Similarly, we have the isomorphism $\Phi^\dagger_{P,O} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)_{|\{P\}\times \boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu} \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}$ over $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$. From the morphisms $\Phi_{P,O}$ and $\Phi^\dagger_{P,O}$, we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\Phi^{\dagger\,-1}_{P,O} \circ \Phi_{P,O} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}.$$

Then we obtain the vector bundle, which we denote by $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P)$ or simply by $S(P)$.

11.3.4 The vector bundle $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$

Similarly we have the following isomorphisms, given in the subsubsection 10.3.1:

$$\Phi^{\mathrm{can}} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda}, \qquad \Phi^{\dagger\ \mathrm{can}} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}(\mathcal{H}^\dagger) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}.$$

Since we have the canonical identification ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathcal{H} = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger}\mathcal{H}^\dagger$, we obtain the isomorphism $\Phi^{\dagger\ \mathrm{can}} \circ (\Phi^{\mathrm{can}})^{-1} : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}$. Thus we obtain the vector bundle, which we denote by $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$.

11.3.5 Pairing

Lemma 11.18 *We have the natural isomorphisms* $\sigma^* S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \simeq S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)^\vee$ *and* $\sigma^* S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P) \simeq S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P)^\vee$.

Proof It follows from Corollary 11.5 and our construction. ▮

Corollary 11.9 *Let* $\boldsymbol{u}$ *be an element of* $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$. *We have the naturally induced pairings:*

$$S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \otimes \sigma^* S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0),$$

$$S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P) \otimes \sigma^* S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E, P) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0).$$

They are perfect. ▮

11.3.6 Nilpotent maps

We have the nilpotent part of the residues $\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}$ on ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}$. We also have $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}$ on ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}$.

Lemma 11.19 *Due to the isomorphisms $\Phi^{\dagger\ \mathrm{can}\ -1}\circ\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}$ or $\Phi^{\dagger\,-1}\circ\Phi_{P,O}$, we have the following:*

$$\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}=-\mu^{-1}\cdot\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}.$$

Proof We have the relation:

$$\exp\Bigl(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}\Bigr)=\exp\Bigl(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mu^{-1}\cdot\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\mu^*}\Bigr).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Thus we obtain the following morphisms:

$$\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}:S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)\longrightarrow S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1),\quad \mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}:S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)\longrightarrow S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1).$$

Here we put $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}:=\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,i}\otimes t_0^{(-1)}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\mu}:=\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{u}^\dagger\,i}\otimes t_\infty^{(-1)}$. Note that we have the relation $t_0^{(-1)}=-\lambda^2\cdot t_\infty^{(-1)}$. Thus $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}$ is well defined.

Lemma 11.20 *The isomorphisms $\sigma^*S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)\simeq S^{\mathrm{can}}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^\vee)$ and $\sigma^*S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)\simeq S_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^\vee,P)$ preserves the nilpotent morphisms.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 11.5 and the relation $\varphi_0(\sigma^*(t_\infty^{(-1)}))=-t_0^{(-1)}$. ▮

Corollary 11.10 *We have the relation $S\bigl(\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)+S\bigl(\mathrm{id}\otimes\sigma^*\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}\bigr)=0$.* ▮

11.3.7 Functoriality

The functoriality of the induced vector bundle can be easily obtained from the functorialities of ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$, ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{H}(E))$, ${}^{l}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$, and the morphisms Φ^{can} and $\Phi_{P,O}$. The lemmas in this subsubsection follows from the results in the subsubsections 8.9.4–8.9.6, 9.3.3–9.3.5, 10.2.4 and 10.3.1–10.3.2.

We have the naturally defined morphisms:

$$S^{\mathrm{can}}_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^\vee)\longrightarrow S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)^\vee,\quad S_{-\boldsymbol{u}}(E^\vee,P)\longrightarrow S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)^\vee. \tag{246}$$

We have the naturally defined nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i^\vee$ on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)^\vee$ and $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)^\vee$.

Lemma 11.21 *The morphisms* (246) *are isomorphic. They are compatible with the pairing. The signature of the nilpotent map is reversed.* ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{b}_i$ $(i=1,2)$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. We have the naturally defined morphism:

$$\begin{gathered}\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}_i\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}_i}\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l}),\\ \boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2=\boldsymbol{u}}} S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(E_1)\otimes S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}(E_2)\longrightarrow S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2}(E_1\otimes E_2),\\ \bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}_i\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}_i}\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l}),\\ \boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2=\boldsymbol{u}}} S_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(E_1,P)\otimes S_{\boldsymbol{u}_2}(E_2,P)\longrightarrow S_{\boldsymbol{u}_1+\boldsymbol{u}_2}(E_1\otimes E_2,P).\end{gathered} \tag{247}$$

Lemma 11.22 *The morphisms* (247) *are isomorphic. They are compatible with the pairings and the nilpotent maps.* ▮

We also have the functoriality for the pull backs. We use the setting in the subsubsection 8.9.6.

Lemma 11.23 *We have the naturally defined isomorphism:*

$$\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_1} S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)\simeq S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\psi^*E),\qquad \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_1} S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,\psi(P))\simeq S_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\psi^*E,P).$$

They are compatible with the nilpotent maps and the pairings. ▮

11.4 $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$

11.4.1 The construction

Let us consider the case $X=\Delta$ and $D=\{O\}$. In this case, we have one nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}$ on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$ and $S_u(E,P)$. Due to Simpson, we know that the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}_{|\lambda}$ are independent of a choice of $\lambda\in\mathbb{P}^1$ (Corollary 7.16). Thus the weight filtrations are the filtration in the category of vector bundles. Thus we obtain the associated graded bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S_u(E,P)$.

We have another construction of $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S_u(E,P)$.

- We have the vector bundles $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(E)$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E)$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$.
- We have the vector bundles $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{H})$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{H}^\dagger)$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$.
- We have the vector bundles $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X}^\sharp$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp\,\dagger}$. We have the canonical isomorphisms:
$$\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{E})_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\times\{O\}}\simeq\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda},\quad \mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu\times\{O\}}\simeq\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}.$$

We have the family of the induced flat connections $\mathbb{D}^f$ and $\mathbb{D}^{\dagger\,f}$ on $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ respectively.

Lemma 11.24 *The monodromy endomorphisms of* $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{E})$ *and* $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ *with respect to the flat connections are of the form:* $F(\lambda)\times$ *identity.* ▮

As in the cases of $S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$, we obtain the isomorphisms:
$$\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}:\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(\mathcal{H})\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda},\quad \Phi^{\mathrm{can}\,\dagger}:\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(\mathcal{H}^\dagger)\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu}.$$

Thus we obtain the gluing of $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E)$ via $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\,\dagger}\circ\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\,-1}$. Thus we obtain the vector bundle, which is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}^W\, S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$.

Similarly we obtain the gluing $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}_u(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E)$ via $\Phi^\dagger_{O,P}\circ\Phi^{-1}_{O,P}$. The resulted vector bundle is naturally isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\, S_u(E,P)$.

11.4.2 The gluing matrices

For simplicity we put as follows:
$$\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E):=\bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)}\mathrm{Gr}^W_k\,\mathcal{G}_u(E),\quad \mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^\dagger(E):=\bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)}\mathrm{Gr}^W_k\,\mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)$ compatible with the grading. We denote the degree of w_i by $u(w_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)$. Let $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^\dagger(E)$. We denote the degree of $w^\dagger_i$ by $u(w^\dagger_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)$.

Remark 11.2 *Note* $u(w^\dagger_i)$ *denotes an element of* $\mathcal{KMS}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0)$ *not* $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger\,0})$. ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)$. We have the dual frame $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ of $\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)\bigr)^\vee$. Via the isomorphism $\sigma^*\,\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^\dagger(E)\simeq\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)\bigr)^\vee$, we obtain $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$.

Lemma 11.25 *We have* $u(w_i)=u(w^\dagger_i)$. ▮

By gluing $(\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\,\dagger})\circ\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\,-1}$, we obtain the relation $\boldsymbol{w}=\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger\cdot A^{\mathrm{can}}$ for some holomorphic function $A^{\mathrm{can}}:\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda\longrightarrow GL(r)$. By gluing $\Phi^\dagger_{P,O}\circ\Phi^{-1}_{P,O}$, we obtain the relation $\boldsymbol{w}=\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger\cdot A_{P,O}$. We would like to give a method to calculate A^{can} and $A_{P,O}$.

We can take the normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ which is a lift of $\boldsymbol{w}$. We can also take the normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$, which is a lift of $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$. Since we have the identification $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})=\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ over $\mathcal{X}^\sharp-\mathcal{D}^\sharp$ as C^∞-bundles, we have the relation:
$$v^\dagger_i=\sum_j v_j\cdot J_{j\,i},\quad \boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger\cdot J.$$

Lemma 11.26 *We have* $J_{j\,i}=0$ *unless* $u(w_i^{\dagger})=u(w_j)$.

Proof It follows from the compatibility of the $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}^{\dagger}$ with the grading. ▮

Lemma 11.27 *In the case* $u(w_i^{\dagger})=u(w_j)=u$, *there exist holomorphic functions* $K_{j\,i}$ *on* $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$ *such that the following holds:*

$$J_{j\,i}=\exp\Bigl(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\cdot\log|z|^2\Bigr)\cdot K_{j\,i}.$$

Proof It follows from a direct calculation. ▮

Corollary 11.11 *There exists the* $GL(r)$*-valued holomorphic function* K *on* $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$ *such that* $J(\lambda,z)=C(\lambda,z)\cdot K(\lambda)$. *Here* $C(\lambda,z)$ *is given as follows:*

$$C(\lambda,z)=\bigoplus_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0),\\ k\in\mathbb{Z}}}\exp\Bigl(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\cdot\log|z|^2\Bigr)\cdot\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u}\,. \tag{248}$$

Here $C(\lambda,z)$ *is regarded as the endomorphism of* $\bigoplus\mathrm{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u$ *via the frame* $\boldsymbol{w}$.

Proof It immediately follows from 11.27. ▮

Lemma 11.28

- *Via the gluing* $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\;\dagger}\circ\Phi^{\mathrm{can}\;-1}$, *we have the relation* $\boldsymbol{w}^{\dagger}=\boldsymbol{w}\cdot K$.
- *Via the gluing* $\Phi^{\dagger}_{O,P}\circ\Phi^{-1}_{O,P}$, *we have the relation* $\boldsymbol{w}^{\dagger}=\boldsymbol{w}\cdot C(\lambda,P)\cdot K(\lambda)$. *Here* $C(\lambda,P)$ *denote the matrix given as follows:*

$$C(\lambda,P)=\bigoplus_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0),\\ k\in\mathbb{Z}}}\exp\Bigl(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\cdot\log|z(P)|^2\Bigr)\cdot\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_{u(E)}}\,. \tag{249}$$

  Here $C(\lambda,P)$ *is regarded as the endomorphism of* $\bigoplus\mathrm{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u$ *via the frame* $\boldsymbol{w}$.

Proof It follows from the definitions and Lemma 11.27. ▮

Corollary 11.12 *The vector bundles* $\mathrm{Gr}_h^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$ *and* $\mathrm{Gr}_h^W S_u(E,P)$ *are isomorphic for any* $u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ *and* $h\in\mathbb{Z}$. ▮

11.4.3 Local lifting and the gluing matrices

Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$, and let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a normalizing frame of the bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}$ as in the previous subsubsection 11.4.2. Let us pick a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^{*}$, and let $U(\lambda_0)$ be an appropriate neighbourhood of λ_0 in $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda^*}$.

Let take a non-negative number $\epsilon=\epsilon(\lambda_0)$ satisfying the following:

- In the case $0\not\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$, we put $\epsilon=0$.
- In the case $0\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})$, ϵ is taken any positive number such that $\{r\,|\,0<r\leq\epsilon\}\cap\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0})=\emptyset$.

For each w_i, the integer $\nu(w_i)=\nu(w_i,\lambda_0)$ is determined by the condition $-1+\epsilon(\lambda_0)<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u(w_i))+\nu(w_i)\leq\epsilon(\lambda_0)$.

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ be a frame of ${}_{\epsilon}\mathcal{E}$ on $X\times U(\lambda_0)$ satisfying the following:

- The frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is compatible with the filtrations $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$, the decompositions $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the weight filtration W.
- We put $\bar{v}_i:=\tilde{v}_i\cdot z^{\nu(w_i)}$. Then the tuple $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}=(\bar{v}_i)$ gives a frame of $\mathcal{E}$ on $(X-D)\times U$ which is compatible with $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and W. Then $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ induces the frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$.

- The induced frame of $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is same as $\boldsymbol{v}$.

Such $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is called a local lift of $\boldsymbol{w}$ around λ_0.

Remark 11.3 *In the case $\lambda_0 = 0$, a local lift $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ of $\boldsymbol{w}$ is a frame of ${}_{\epsilon(0)}\mathcal{E}$ on $U(0) \times X$ satisfying the following:*

- *$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is compatible with the decomposition $\mathbb{E}^{(0)}$, the parabolic filtration $F^{(0)}$, and the weight filtration W.*
- *Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ induces the frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E)$ on a neighbourhood of $U(0)$. The induced frame is same as $\boldsymbol{w}$.* ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\mu$, and let $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ be a normalizing frame of the bundle $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ over $X^\dagger \times \boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$ as in the subsubsection 11.4.2. Let $U(\lambda_0)$ be as above. Note that λ_0 gives the point $\mu_0 = \lambda_0^{-1} \in \boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$. Let U' denote the neighbourhood of λ_0^{-1} corresponding to $U(\lambda_0)$ via the isomorphism $\boldsymbol{C}^*_\lambda \simeq \boldsymbol{C}^*_\mu$.

We have the non-negative number $\epsilon' = \epsilon\bigl(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1}\bigr)$. For each $w_i^\dagger$, the integer $\nu(w_i^\dagger)$ is determined by the condition $-\epsilon' < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0^{-1}, u(w_i^\dagger)^\dagger) + \nu(w_i^\dagger) \leq 1 - \epsilon'$. We can take a frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ of ${}_{1-\epsilon'}\mathcal{E}^\dagger$ satisfying the following:

- The frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ is compatible with $\mathcal{F}^{(\mu_0)}$, $\mathbb{E}^{(\mu_0)}$ and W.
- We put $\bar{v}_i^\dagger = \bar{z}^{\nu(w_i^\dagger)} \cdot \tilde{v}_i^\dagger$. Then the frame $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ is compatible with $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and W. Then $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ induces the frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(E)$.
- The induced frame of $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ is same as $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$.

Such $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ is called a local lift of $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ around μ_0.

Remark 11.4 *As in Remark* 11.3*, a local lift at $\mu_0 = 0$ is also defined, similarly.* ▮

On $(X - D) \times U = (X^\dagger - D^\dagger) \times U'$, we have $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^\dagger$ as U-holomorphic bundles. Hence we obtain the relation:

$$\tilde{v}_i^\dagger = \sum \tilde{J}_{j\,i} \cdot \tilde{v}_j.$$

Here $\tilde{J}_{j\,i}$ are U-holomorphic.

Lemma 11.29 *In the case $\tilde{J}_{j\,i} \neq 0$, we have the following:*

$$\mathfrak{e}^f\bigl(\lambda_0^{-1}, u(w_i^\dagger)^\dagger\bigr) = \mathfrak{e}^f\bigl(\lambda_0, u(w_j)\bigr)^{-1}, \quad \mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\lambda_0^{-1}, u(w_i^\dagger)^\dagger\bigr) \geq \mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\lambda_0, u(w_j)\bigr), \quad \deg^W(w_i^\dagger) \geq \deg^W(w_j).$$

Here $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ as in the subsubsection 11.4.2.

Proof It follows from the compatibility of the $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ and the filtrations and the decompositions. ▮

Lemma 11.30 *In the case $u(w_i^\dagger) = u(w_j^\dagger)$ and $\deg^W(w_i^\dagger) = \deg^W(w_j)$, we have the relation:*

$$\tilde{J}_{j\,i} = J_{j\,i} \cdot z^{\nu(w_i)} \cdot \bar{z}^{-\nu(w_i^\dagger)}.$$

Proof It follows from the condition that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\dagger$ are lifts of $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ respectively. ▮

12 Limiting mixed twistor theorem

12.1 Limiting mixed twistor theorem in the case of curves

12.1.1 Preliminary

We put $X = \Delta$ and $D = \{O\}$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. We can take a model bundle $(E_0, \overline{\partial}_{E_0}, h_0, \theta_0)$. We denote the deformed holomorphic bundle of E_0 by $\mathcal{E}_0$.

Let $\boldsymbol{e}$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_0$ be holomorphic frames of ${}^\diamond E$ and ${}^\diamond E_0$ respectively, which are compatible with F, $\mathbb{E}$ and W. We take the isomorphism $\Phi : {}^\diamond E_0 \longrightarrow {}^\diamond E$ via the condition $\Phi(\boldsymbol{e}_0) = \boldsymbol{e}$. It satisfies the following:

- The morphism Φ is compatible with $\mathbb{E}$, F and W at the origin O.
- We have the induced isomorphism $\mathrm{Gr}^F\Phi : \mathrm{Gr}^F({}^{\diamond}E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^F({}^{\diamond}E)$ and the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Gr}^F\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\theta)\bigr)$ $\mathrm{Gr}^F\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\theta_0))\bigr)$. Under the isomorphism Gr^F, we have $\mathrm{Gr}^F\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\theta)\bigr) = \mathrm{Gr}^F\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\theta_0)\bigr)$.

Recall that the morphism Φ and Φ^{-1} give the isomorphism of E and E_0 which are bounded with respect to the metrics h and h_0, due to Simpson. (See the subsubsection 4.3.3 in the previous paper, for example.)

We use the setting of the subsubsection 11.4.3. Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be the normalizing frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ over $\mathcal{X}$ as in the subsubsection 11.4.3. Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Let $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda_0)$ be the non-negative number and $U(\lambda_0)$ be an appropriate neighbourhood of λ_0 as in the subsubsection 11.4.3. Let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)}$ be a local lift of $\boldsymbol{w}$ on $X\times U(\lambda_0)$. (Note that we use the notation $\boldsymbol{v}$ instead of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$, for simplicity). In the case $\lambda_0 = 0$, we may assume $\boldsymbol{v}^{(0)}_{|X\times\{0\}} = \boldsymbol{e}$.

On the other hand, let $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ be a frame of $\mathrm{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E_0)$ over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We may assume that we can take the canonical frame $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}_{\epsilon(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{E}_0$ on $X\times U(\lambda_0)$, which induce $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ (See the subsubsection 6.2.7 for a canonical frame). It is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and W of $\mathcal{E}_0$, in the case $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. In the case $\lambda_0 = 0$, it is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(0)}$, $F^{(0)}$ and W.

We put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} &= \bigl(v_i^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}\bigr), \quad v_i^{(\lambda_0)\prime} := v_i^{(\lambda_0)}\cdot|z|^{b(v_i)}\cdot\bigl(-\log|z|\bigr)^{-\frac{1}{2}k(v_i)}, \\ \boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} &= \bigl(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}\bigr), \quad v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\prime} := v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}\cdot|z|^{b(v_{0\,i})}\cdot\bigl(-\log|z|\bigr)^{-\frac{1}{2}k(v_{0\,i})}. \end{aligned} \tag{250}$$

Here we put $b(v_i)(\lambda) := \deg^F(v_{i\,|\,\lambda})$ and $k(v_i) := \deg^W(v_i)$, and similar to $b(v_{0\,i})$ and $k(v_{0\,i})$.

We put $r := \mathrm{rank}(E)$. We have the $GL(r)$-valued C^∞-functions $B^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $B_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ determined by the following conditions:

$$\boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{e}'\cdot B^{(\lambda_0)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{v}_0' = \boldsymbol{e}_0'\cdot B_0^{(\lambda_0)}. \tag{251}$$

The functions $I_{i\,j}^{(\lambda_0)\prime}$ are determined as follows:

$$\Phi(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\prime}) = \sum I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\prime}\cdot v_j^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}.$$

Then we obtain the $M(r)$-valued function $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} := \bigl(I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}\bigr) : U(\lambda_0)\times(X-D) \longrightarrow M(r)$. The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 12.1 *In the case* $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}) = \deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j^{(\lambda_0)})$ *and* $k(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}) = k(v_j^{(\lambda_0)})$*, the function* $I_{i\,j}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ *is holomorphic with respect to the variable* λ.

Proof If we denote $\Phi(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}) = \sum I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}\cdot v_j^{(\lambda_0)}$, then $I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}$ are holomorphic with respect to λ. Then the lemma immediately follows. ∎

Lemma 12.2

- $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ *and* $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime\,-1}$ *are bounded.*
- *We have the estimate* $|I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\prime}| \leq C\cdot(-\log|z|)^{-1}$ *unless* $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}) = \deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j^{(\lambda_0)})$.
- *In the case* $\deg^W\bigl(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr) \neq \deg^W\bigl(v_j^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)$*, we have the following finiteness:*

$$\int_{U(\lambda_0)} ||I_{j\,i}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}||_W < \infty.$$

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 7.5. ∎

12.1.2 The construction of the isomorphism Ψ

Let $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E_0)$ be as in the subsubsection 11.4.2. In this subsubsection, we would like to construct the holomorphic isomorphism $\Psi : \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E_0)$.

For any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, we take neighbourhood $U(\lambda_0)$ as in the subsubsection 11.4.3. Then we obtain the covering $\bigl\{U(\lambda_0) \bigm| \lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda\bigr\}$ of the complex plane $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Then we can take a discrete subset S of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ such that $\bigl\{U(\lambda_0) \bigm| \lambda_0 \in S\bigr\}$ is a covering of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We may assume that $0 \in S$.

On each $X \times U(\lambda_0)$ ($\lambda_0 \in S$), we have the frames $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}_\epsilon\mathcal{E}$ and ${}_\epsilon\mathcal{E}_0$ respectively, as in the subsubsection 12.1.1. We recall that we assume that $\boldsymbol{v}^{(0)}_{|\mathcal{X}^0} = \boldsymbol{e}$, $\boldsymbol{v}^{(0)}_{0|\mathcal{X}^0} = \boldsymbol{e}_0$ and $\Phi(\boldsymbol{e}_0) = \boldsymbol{e}$. In the following, we identify E and E_0 via the isomorphism Φ as C^∞-vector bundles on $X - D$.

Lemma 12.3 *We can take a sequence of subsets $\bigl\{U_N \subset X - D \bigm| N = 1, 2, \ldots\bigr\}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *The volume of U_N with respect to the measure $\dfrac{|dz| \cdot |d\bar{z}|}{|z|^2 \cdot (-\log|z|) \cdot \log(-\log|z|)}$ is infinite.*
2. *$U_N \supset U_{N+1}$.*
3. *Let P be any point of U_N and λ_0 be any point of $\bigl\{\lambda \in S \bigm| |\lambda| < N\bigr\}$. Then the inequality $\bigl|I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}_{j\,i}(P)\bigr| \le N^{-1}$ holds for any i and j such that $\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},W}\bigl(v^{(\lambda_0)}_{0\,i}\bigr) \neq \deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},W}\bigl(v^{(\lambda_0)}_{j}\bigr)$.*
4. *Let $\boldsymbol{e}$ be a frame of ${}^\diamond E$ as above. For any point $P \in U_N$, the inequality $|h(e'_i, e'_j)(P)| \le N^{-1}$ holds, in the case $\deg^{\mathbb{E},F,W}(e_i) \neq \deg^{\mathbb{E},F,W}(e_j)$.*
5. *For any point $P \in U_N$, the following inequalities hold:*

$$|z| \cdot (-\log|z|) \cdot \bigl|(\theta_0 - \theta)\bigr|_h(P) \le N^{-1}, \qquad |z| \cdot (-\log|z|) \cdot \bigl|(\theta_0^\dagger - \theta^\dagger)\bigr|_h(P) \le N^{-1}.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 12.2, the asymptotic orthogonality (the subsubsections 7.6.1, 7.6.3 and 7.6.4), Lemma 7.38, and our choice $\mathrm{Gr}^F\bigl(\mathrm{Res}(\theta - \theta_0)\bigr) = 0$. $\blacksquare$

Let us pick points $P_N \in U_N$ such that $\lim_{N\to\infty} P_N = O$.

Lemma 12.4 *Note that we have the following for any $\lambda_0 \in S$:*

1. *For any point $\lambda \in U(\lambda_0)$, we have $\lim_{N\to\infty} I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}_{j\,i}(\lambda, P_N) = 0$ in the case $\deg^{\mathbb{E},F,W}(v^{(\lambda_0)}_{0\,i}) \neq \deg^{\mathbb{E},F,W}(v^{(\lambda_0)}_{j})$. It follows from the claim 3 in Lemma 12.3.*
2. *The $M(r)$-valued functions $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}}$ and $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime\,-1}_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}}$ are bounded. In the case $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}\,W}(v_{0\,i}) = \deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},F^{(\lambda_0)}\,W}(v_j)$, the function $I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}_{\infty\,i\,j\,|\,U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}}$ is holomorphic with respect to the variable λ.*
3. *The sequences of hermitian matrices $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N}\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')^{-1}_{|P_N}\bigr\}$ are bounded.* $\blacksquare$

Lemma 12.5 *By taking a subsequence $\{N_i\}$ of $\{N\}$, we may assume that $\bigl\{I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_{N_i}\}}\bigr\}$, $\bigl\{I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime\,-1}_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_{N_i}\}}\bigr\}$, $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_{N_i}}\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')^{-1}_{|P_{N_i}}\bigr\}$ are convergent for any $\lambda_0 \in S$.*

Proof Since $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N}\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')^{-1}_{|P_N}\bigr\}$ are bounded sequences of hermitian matrices, we can take a convergent subsequence, when we fix λ_0. Due to the claims 1 and 2 in Lemma 12.4, we can take a convergent subsequences of $\bigl\{I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime\,-1}_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}}\bigr\}$ when we fix λ_0. Then we obtain the lemma by using the standard diagonal argument. $\blacksquare$

We denote the limit by $I_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ and $H_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)}$. Then $I_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ is holomorphic $M(r)$-valued function on $U(\lambda_0)$ (note the claim 2 in Lemma 12.4). Due to our construction and the claim 1 in Lemma 12.4, the $M(r)$-valued function $I_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ can be regarded as the direct sum:

$$\bigoplus_{(u,k)\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0)\times\mathbb{Z}} I_{u,k}^{(\lambda_0)},\quad I_{u,k}^{(\lambda_0)}:=\Bigl(I_{\infty\,i,j}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}\;\Big|\;\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},W}\bigl(v_{0\,i}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)=\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)},W}\bigl(v_j^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)=\bigl(\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,u),k\bigr)\Bigr).$$

Then the frames $\boldsymbol{w}$, $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ and the function $I_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ induce the isomorphism defined on $U(\lambda_0)$:

$$\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}:\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E_0)_{|U(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)_{|U(\lambda_0)}.$$

Note that we use the following easy lemma implicitly.

Lemma 12.6 *In the case* $\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_{0\,i})=\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$, *we have* $\nu(w_{0\,i},\lambda_0)=\nu(w_j,\lambda_0)$. *(See the subsubsection* 11.4.3 *for* $\nu(w_j,\lambda_0)$*).* ∎

It is easy to check the following lemma.

Lemma 12.7

- *Fix a subsequence* $\{P_l\}$. *Then the morphism* $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is independent of choices of* $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\boldsymbol{w}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{w}_0$.
- *In the case* $A:=U(\lambda_0)\cap U(\lambda_1)\neq\emptyset$, *we have* $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{|A}=\Psi^{(\lambda_1)}_{|A}$.
- *In particular, we obtain the global isomorphism on* $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$*:*

$$\Psi:\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E_0)\longrightarrow\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E).$$

Once we fix a subsequence $\{P_l\}$, *then the morphism* Ψ *is independent of choices of* $\boldsymbol{w}$, $\boldsymbol{w}_0$, $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ *and* S. ∎

In the following, we may assume that $\Psi(\boldsymbol{w}_0)=\boldsymbol{w}$. We can also take S as $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ not a discrete subset.

On the other hand $H_{\infty}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is a positive definite hermitian matrix, and it can be regarded as a direct sum of the hermitian matrices $H_u^{(\lambda_0)}$ ($u\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\epsilon}\mathcal{E}^0)$), due to the claim 3 in Lemma 12.4. We have the induced hermitian metric $h_{u,k}$ on the vector space $\operatorname{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|0}$ induced by $H_{u,k}$.

12.1.3 Modification of the model bundle

We put $\theta=f_0\cdot dz/z$ and $\theta^\dagger=f_0^\dagger\cdot d\bar{z}/\bar{z}$. We pick ρ as in (111) in the page 114. Then the sequence of the endomorphisms $\bigl\{(-\log|z|)\cdot\bigl(f_0(P_N)-\rho(P_N)\bigr)\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{(-\log|z|)\cdot\bigl(f_0^\dagger(P_N)-\rho^\dagger(P_N)\bigr)\bigr\}$ converges to the morphisms, due to the condition 5 in Lemma 12.3 and Proposition 7.1:

$$f_\infty:\operatorname{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|0}\longrightarrow\operatorname{Gr}_{k-2}^W\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|0},$$

$$f_\infty^\dagger:\operatorname{Gr}_k^W\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|0}\longrightarrow\operatorname{Gr}_{k+2}^W\mathcal{G}_u(E)_{|0}.$$

By our construction f_∞ and $f_\infty^\dagger$ are mutually adjoint with respect to the metric $h_\infty=\bigoplus h_{u,k}$.

On the other hand, we have the metric $h_{0\,u\,k}$ on $\operatorname{Gr}_k^W(\mathcal{G}_u(E_0))$. We also have the morphisms $f_{0\,\infty}$ and $f_{0\,\infty}^\dagger$, which coincides f_∞ and $f_\infty^\dagger$ under the isomorphism Ψ, due to the conditions 4 and 5 in Lemma 12.3.

In the following, we identify $\operatorname{Gr}_k^W(\mathcal{G}_u(E_0))$ and $\operatorname{Gr}_k^W(\mathcal{G}_u(E))$ via the isomorphism Ψ. We also identify $(f_\infty,f_\infty^\dagger)$ and $(f_{0\,\infty},f_{0\,\infty}^\dagger)$.

We have the primitive decomposition $\operatorname{Gr}^W=\bigoplus P_hGr_k^W$ with respect to the morphisms $f_\infty=f_{0\,\infty}$.

From the construction of the model bundle, the primitive decomposition is orthogonal with respect to the hermitian metric $h_{0\,\infty}$. In particular, the morphism $f_\infty^\dagger=f_{0\,\infty}^\dagger$ preserves the primitive decomposition.

Lemma 12.8 *The primitive decomposition is orthogonal with respect to the hermitian metric* h_∞.

Proof Since we have $f^{\dagger}_{\infty}=f^{\dagger}_{0\,\infty}$, the morphism $f^{\dagger}_{\infty}$ preserves the primitive decomposition. It implies the orthogonality of the primitive decomposition with respect to the metric h_{∞}. ▮

It is easy to see that the model bundle $(E_0,\overline{\partial}_{E_0},h_0,\theta_0)$ is isomorphic to the following:

$$\bigoplus_{k,u}(P_k\operatorname{Gr}^W_k, H_{0,u,k})\otimes Mod(k)\otimes L(u).$$

We have the other model bundle $(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},h_1,\theta_1)$ given as follows:

$$\bigoplus_{k,u}(P_k\operatorname{Gr}^W_k, H_{u,k})\otimes Mod(k)\otimes L(u).$$

Note that we have the natural isomorphism of the deformed holomorphic bundles $\mathcal{E}_0$ and $\mathcal{E}_1$ compatible with λ-connections, which is mutually bounded, and thus we have $\mathcal{G}_u(E_1)\simeq\mathcal{G}_u(E_0)$, and then $H_{1\,u\,h}=H_{u\,h}$. Thus we may assume $H_{0\,u\,h}=H_{u\,h}$ from the beginning.

12.1.4 The morphism $\Psi^{\dagger}$

Since we have the isomorphism $\sigma^*\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}\simeq\bigl(\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}\bigr)^{\vee}$, the isomorphism Ψ induces the isomorphism $\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}(E_0)\longrightarrow\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}(E)$. It can be regarded as follows (Lemma 12.9):

Let $\boldsymbol{w}^{\dagger}$ be the frame of $\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}(E)$, which is induced by the dual frame $\boldsymbol{w}^{\vee}$ of $\bigl(\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}(E)\bigr)^{\vee}$ via the isomorphism $\sigma^*\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}\simeq\bigl(\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}\bigr)^{\vee}$. Similarly we have the frame $\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\dagger}$ of $\operatorname{Gr}^W\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}(E_0)$.

On the other hand, we have the frame $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger}$ of ${}_{1-\epsilon(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ over $\sigma(U(\lambda_0))\times X$ given as in (238):

$$\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger}=\sigma^*\Bigl(\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)})}^{-1}\Bigr). \tag{252}$$

It is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger}$ is a local lift of $\boldsymbol{w}^{\dagger}$ around $-\overline{\lambda}_0$. Similarly we obtain the local lift $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger}$ of $\boldsymbol{w}_0^{\dagger}$ around $-\overline{\lambda}_0$.

From (252), we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger\,\prime}=\sigma^*\Bigl(\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime})}^{-1}\Bigr)&=\sigma^*\Bigl(\boldsymbol{e}'\cdot B^{(\lambda_0)}\cdot\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime})}^{-1}\Bigr)\\&=\boldsymbol{e}'\cdot\sigma^*\Bigl(\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')}^{-1}\cdot{}^t\overline{B}^{(\lambda_0)\,-1}\Bigr).\end{aligned} \tag{253}$$

Similarly we have the following:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger\,\prime}=\boldsymbol{e}_0'\cdot\sigma^*\Bigl(\overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}_0')}^{-1}\cdot{}^t\overline{B}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,-1}\Bigr). \tag{254}$$

We determine the $GL(r)$-valued function $C^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $\sigma(U(\lambda_0))\times(X-D)$ by the following condition:

$$\Phi\bigl(\boldsymbol{v}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger\,\prime}\bigr)=\boldsymbol{v}^{(\lambda_0)\,\dagger\,\prime}\cdot C^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

Lemma 12.9 *Let $\{P_l\}$ be a sequence as in Lemma* 12.7*. The sequence $\bigl\{C^{(\lambda_0)}(\lambda,P_l)\bigr\}$ converges to the identity matrix.*

Proof Recall that we have the following, due to $\Psi(\boldsymbol{w}_0)=\boldsymbol{w}$:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\bigl(B^{(\lambda_0)\,-1}\cdot B_0^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)(\lambda,P_N)=\lim_{N\to\infty}I^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}(\lambda,P_N)=\text{the identity matrix}$$

We also have the following, due to the modification in the subsubsection 12.1.3:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}H(h,\boldsymbol{e}_0')^{-1}_{|P_N}\cdot H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N}=\text{the identity matrix.}$$

We also have the boundedness of the sequences $\bigl\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N}\bigr\}$, $\bigl\{H(h_0,\boldsymbol{e}_0')_{|P_N}\bigr\}$, $\bigl\{B^{(\lambda_0)\,-1}(\lambda,P_N)\bigr\}$ and $\bigl\{B_0^{(\lambda_0)}(\lambda,P_N)\bigr\}$. Then the lemma immediately follows from (253) and (254). ▮

12.1.5 The isomorphism of induced vector bundles

In the subsubsection 12.1.2, we constructed the isomorphism $\Psi : \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E)$. In the subsubsection 12.1.4, we obtained the isomorphism $\Psi^\dagger : \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(E)$. They induce the isomorphisms for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$:

$$\Psi : \mathrm{Gr}^W_k \mathcal{G}_u(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W_k \mathcal{G}_u(E), \quad \Psi^\dagger : \mathrm{Gr}^W_k \mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W_k \mathcal{G}^\dagger_{u^\dagger}(E).$$

Proposition 12.1 *Let k be an integer and u be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0)$. The isomorphisms Ψ and $\Psi^\dagger$ induce the isomorphisms $\Psi^\triangle : \mathrm{Gr}^W_k S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E)$ and $\Psi^\triangle : \mathrm{Gr}^W_k S_u(E_0, P) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W_k S_u(E, P)$.*

Proof We have only to show that the morphisms are compatible with the gluings. For simplicity, we put as follows:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}(E) := \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(^\circ\mathcal{E}^0)} \mathrm{Gr}^W_k S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E).$$

Similarly, we have $\mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0)$. We have only to show that Ψ and $\Psi^\dagger$ induce the isomorphism of $\mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}(E)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ be frames of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(E_0)$ respectively such that $\Psi(\boldsymbol{w}_0) = \boldsymbol{w}$. We have the induced frames $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_0^\dagger$ of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(E)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(E_0)$ respectively. We have $\Psi^\dagger(\boldsymbol{w}_0^\dagger) = \boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$. We use $u(w_i) = u(w_{0\,i}) = u(w_i^\dagger) = u(w_{0\,i}^\dagger)$ without mention. We also use $\deg^W(w_i) = \deg^W(w_{0\,i})$ and $\deg^W(w_i^\dagger) = \deg^W(w_{0\,i}^\dagger)$.

Remark 12.1 *We also have* $\deg^W(w_i) = -\deg^W(w_i^\dagger)$. ∎

We have the normalizing frames $\boldsymbol{v}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{v}_0$) of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$ (resp. $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}_0)$) over $\mathcal{X}^\sharp$, which is a lift of $\boldsymbol{w}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{w}_0$). We also have the normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{v}_0^\dagger$) of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}^\dagger)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}^\dagger(\mathcal{E}_0^\dagger)$), which is a lift of $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{w}_0^\dagger$).

Remark 12.2 *Note that we use $\boldsymbol{v}$ as a normalizing frame of* $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E})$*, not a local lift.* ∎

We have the relations $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \cdot J$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_0 = \boldsymbol{v}_0^\dagger \cdot J_0$. It is clear that Proposition 12.1 can be reduced to the following lemma, due to Lemma 11.28.

Lemma 12.10 *We have $J = J_0$.*

Proof Let λ_0 be any point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We can take local lifts $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\boldsymbol{w}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ on $U(\lambda_0)$, which induce the normalizing frames $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_0$. We take C^∞-frames $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime}$ as in (243). We have the functions $B^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $B_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ from $(X-D)\times U(\lambda_0)$ to $GL(r)$ determined by the conditions $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} = \boldsymbol{e}' \cdot B^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} = \boldsymbol{e}'_0 \cdot B_0^{(\lambda_0)}$, as in (251).

On the other hand, we put $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})} := \bigl(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}\bigr)^\dagger$ as in (252). Similarly we obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})}$.

Lemma 12.11 *The frames $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})}$ are local lifts of $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_0^\dagger$ respectively. They induce the normalizing frames $\boldsymbol{v}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})}$ respectively.*

Proof It is easy to check the claim from the definitions. ∎

We obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})\,\prime}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})\,\prime}$ as in (243). Then we have the following relations:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})\,\prime} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} \cdot \tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}, \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})\,\prime} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} \cdot \tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

On the other hand, we have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\dagger\,(\lambda_0^{-1})\,\prime} = \sigma^*\Bigl(\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})\,\prime} \cdot \overline{H(h, \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})\,\prime})^{-1}}\Bigr) = \boldsymbol{e}' \cdot \overline{H(h, \boldsymbol{e}')}^{-1} \cdot \sigma^*\bigl(\overline{{}^tB^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}}\bigr)^{-1} \\ = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} \cdot B^{(\lambda_0)\,-1} \cdot \overline{H(h, \boldsymbol{e}')}^{-1} \cdot \sigma^*\bigl(\overline{{}^tB^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}}\bigr)^{-1}. \quad (255)\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain the relation:

$$\tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)} = B^{(\lambda_0)\,-1} \cdot \overline{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')}^{-1} \cdot \sigma^* \big(\overline{{}^t B^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}}\big)^{-1}.$$

Similarly we have the relation:

$$\tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)} = B_0^{(\lambda_0)\,-1} \cdot \overline{H(h_0,\boldsymbol{e}'_0)}^{-1} \cdot \sigma^* \big(\overline{{}^t B_0^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}}\big)^{-1}.$$

Lemma 12.12 *Let* $\{P_n\}$ *be as in the subsubsection* 12.1.2. *We have the following:*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big(\big(B_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1} \cdot B^{(\lambda_0)}\Big)_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}} = \text{the identity matrix},$$

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big(\big(B_0^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}\big)^{-1} \cdot B^{(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1})}\Big)_{|\sigma(U(\lambda))\times\{P_N\}} = \text{the identity matrix}.$$

Proof We have the relation: $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_0^{(\lambda_0)\,\prime} \cdot \big(B_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1} \cdot B^{(\lambda_0)}$. Thus the first claim follows from our construction of the morphism Ψ and $\Psi(\boldsymbol{w}_0) = \boldsymbol{w}$. The second claim can be shown similarly. ∎

Lemma 12.13 *Let* $\{P_N\}$ *be as in the subsubsection* 12.1.2. *We have the following:*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N} \cdot H(h_0,\boldsymbol{e}'_0)^{-1}_{|P_N} = \text{the identity matrix}.$$

Proof It follows from our construction (See the subsubsection 12.1.3). ∎

Lemma 12.14 *We have the following:*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big(\big(\tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}\Big)_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}} = \text{the identity matrix}$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 12.12, Lemma 12.13 and the boundedness of the sequences $\big\{H(h,\boldsymbol{e}')_{|P_N}\big\}$ etc. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Lemma 12.10. In the case $u(w_i^{\dagger}) = u(w_j) = u$ and $\deg^W(w_i^{\dagger}) = \deg^W(w_j) = h$, we can develop the (i,j)-component of $\big(\tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}$ can be developed as follows, by using Lemma 11.29:

$$\Big(\big(\tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1} \cdot \tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}\Big)_{i\,j} = \sum_{\substack{u(w_k^{\dagger})=u,\\ \deg^W(w_k^{\dagger})=h}} \big(\tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1}_{i,k} \cdot \tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}_{k,j}.$$

Due to Lemma 11.29 and Lemma 11.30, we have the following, in the case $u(w_i^{\dagger}) = u(w_j) = u$, and $\deg^W(w_i^{\dagger}) = \deg^W(w_j)$:

$$\tilde{J}^{(\lambda_0)}_{i\,j} = J_{i\,j} \cdot z^{\nu(w_i)} \cdot \bar{z}^{\nu(w_j^{\dagger})}, \quad \big(\tilde{J}_0^{(\lambda_0)}\big)^{-1}_{i\,j} = \big(J_0^{-1}\big)_{i\,j} \cdot z^{-\nu(w_i)} \cdot \bar{z}^{-\nu(w_j^{\dagger})}.$$

Then we obtain the following:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big(J_0^{-1} \cdot J\Big)_{|U(\lambda_0)\times\{P_N\}} = \text{the identity matrix}.$$

Due to Corollary 11.11, we have the $GL(r)$-valued holomorphic functions K and K_0 on $\boldsymbol{C}^*$ such that $J(\lambda,z) = K(\lambda)\cdot C(\lambda,z)$ and $J_0(\lambda,z) = K_0(\lambda)\cdot C(\lambda,z)$, where $C(\lambda,z)$ is given by the formula (248). Thus we obtain the following:

$$\text{the identity matrix} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \big(K_0(\lambda)\cdot C(\lambda,P_N)\big)^{-1} \cdot K(\lambda)\cdot C(\lambda,P_N) = \lim_{N\to\infty} K_0(\lambda)^{-1}\cdot K(\lambda) = K_0(\lambda)^{-1}\cdot K(\lambda).$$

Note $K(\lambda)$, $K_0(\lambda)$ and $C(\lambda,z)$ are commutative. Thus we obtain $K(\lambda) = K_0(\lambda)$. Then the equality $J(\lambda,z) = J_0(\lambda,z)$ holds. Therefore we obtain Lemma 12.10, and thus Proposition 12.1. ∎

12.1.6 Theorem (the one dimensional case)

Proposition 12.2 *The tuples* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E), W, N^{\triangle}, S)$ *and* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0), W, N^{\triangle}, S)$ *are isomorphic. The tuples* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S_u(E_0, P), W, N_0^{\triangle}, S_0)$ *and* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S_u(E, P), W, N^{\triangle}, S)$ *are isomorphic.*

Proof We have already constructed the isomorphism $\Psi^{\triangle} : S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E) \longrightarrow S^{\mathrm{can}}$. Under the isomorphism, the restrictions of the morphisms $N_0^{\triangle} : \mathrm{Gr}_k^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{k-2}^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ and $N^{\triangle} : \mathrm{Gr}_k^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{k-2}^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ to the fibers on $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ are same. Since $\mathrm{Gr}_k^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}_{k-2}^W S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E_0) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ are pure twistors of weight k, we obtain the coincidence $N_0^{\triangle} = N^{\triangle}$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. Similarly we obtain the coincidence $S_0 = S$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. ▮

Then we obtain the following immediately.

Theorem 12.1 *The tuples* $(S_u^{\mathrm{can}}(E), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S)$ *and* $(S_u(E, P), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S)$ $(P \in X - D)$ *are polarized mixed twistor of* $(0,1)$*-type.* ▮

12.2 Limiting mixed twistor theorem in the higher dimensional case

12.2.1 Preliminary

Let S_i $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ be finite subsets of $\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$. For any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^l$, we have the map $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{c}} : \prod_{i=1}^l S_i \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$ as follows:

$$\varphi_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \sum c_i \cdot u_i.$$

Let T denotes the set of the elements $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^l$ such that $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ are injective.

Lemma 12.15 *The set T is Zariski dense in $\boldsymbol{C}^l$. Namely, there does not exists a closed subset Z of $\boldsymbol{C}^l$ defined as a zero set of some polynomials such that $T \subset Z$.*

Proof We put as follows:

$$\eta_i := \min\bigl\{|d - d'| \bigm| d, d' \in S_i,\ \ d \neq d'\bigr\}$$

$$\xi_i := \max\bigl\{|d - d'| \bigm| d, d' \in S_i\bigr\}.$$

Then the set T contains any elements $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_i)$ such that $c_i \cdot \xi_i < 3^{-1} \cdot c_{i+1} \cdot \eta_{i+1}$. Then it is easy to see that T is Zariski dense in $\boldsymbol{C}^n$. ▮

We put $S(\boldsymbol{c}) := \bigl\{\varphi_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\boldsymbol{u}) \bigm| \boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_{i=1}^l S_i\bigr\}$. A complex number λ is called generic with respect to S_i $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ and $S(\boldsymbol{c})$ $(\boldsymbol{c} \in T)$, if the maps $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda) : S_i \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$ and $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda) : S(\boldsymbol{c}) \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$ are injective.

Lemma 12.16 *The set of the complex numbers, which are not generic with respect to S_i $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ and $S(\boldsymbol{c})$ $(\boldsymbol{c} \in T)$, is discrete in $\boldsymbol{C}^*$.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 7.65. ▮

12.2.2 Weak result

We put $X = \Delta^n$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. We put $S_i := \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ and we use Lemma 12.15. Let us take a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}^*$ which is generic with respect to S_i $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ and $S(\boldsymbol{c})$ $(\boldsymbol{c} \in T)$.

Let us consider the morphism $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}} : \Delta \longrightarrow X$ given by $z \longmapsto \bigl(z_1^{c_1}, \ldots, z_n^{c_n}\bigr)$. The image is denoted by $C(\boldsymbol{c})$. Via the pull back, we obtain the harmonic bundle $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ over the punctured disc $\Delta - \{O\}$.

Lemma 12.17

- *The morphism* $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{KMS}(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^* \mathcal{E}^0)$ *is given by the correspondence* $\boldsymbol{u} \longmapsto \boldsymbol{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = \sum c_i \cdot u_i$.
- *The morphism is injective.*

- λ_0 *is generic with respect to the sets* $\mathcal{KMS}(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}^0)$ *for any* $\boldsymbol{c}\in T$.

Proof The first claim follows from Corollary 8.14. The following map is injective, due to our choices of $\boldsymbol{c}$ and λ_0:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l}\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)\longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C},\quad \boldsymbol{u}\longmapsto \lambda_0^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}).$$

Then the second and the third claims are obtained. ■

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{l})$. We have the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i^{\lambda_0}$ $(i=1,\ldots,n)$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,(\lambda_0,O)}$ induced by the residues. For any element $\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{C}^n$, we put $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{d}):=\sum d_i\cdot\mathcal{N}_i^{\lambda_0}$. Then $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{d})$ is the endomorphism of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,(\lambda_0,O)}$. We also put $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{t}):=\sum t_i\cdot\mathcal{N}_i^{\lambda_0}$ for variables t_i. Then $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{t})$ is the endomorphism of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,(\lambda_0,O)}\otimes_{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{C}(t_1,\ldots,t_n)$. Recall that if the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{d})$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{t})$ are same, then $\boldsymbol{d}$ is called generic with respect to the tuple $\big(\mathcal{N}_1^{\lambda_0},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_l^{\lambda_0}\big)$. The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 12.18 *Let* T_1 *denote the subset of* T*, which consists of the elements* $\mathbf{c}$ *which are generic with respect to* $(\mathcal{N}_1^{\lambda_0},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_l^{\lambda_0})$*. Then* T_1 *is Zariski dense in* $\boldsymbol{C}^l$. ■

Lemma 12.19 *We have the isomorphisms:*

$$S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)\simeq S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}E\big),\quad S_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big(E,\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}(P)\big)\simeq S_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}E,P\big).$$

The isomorphisms are compatible with the pairings. Under the isomorphisms, the nilpotent induced by the residue on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}E\big)$ *and* $S_{\boldsymbol{c}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}E,P\big)$ *are given by* $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}(\boldsymbol{c})=\sum c_i\cdot\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}$.

Proof It follows from Lemma 11.23 and the injectivity in Lemma 12.17. ■

Let $W(\boldsymbol{c})$ denote the weight filtration on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ or $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$ induced by the nilpotent map $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle}(\boldsymbol{c})$.

Corollary 12.1 *Let* $\mathbf{c}$ *be an element of* T*. The filtered vector bundles* $(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E),W(\mathbf{c}))$ *and* $(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P),W(\mathbf{c}))$ *are the mixed twistor structure.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 12.19 and Theorem 12.1. ■

Lemma 12.20 *Let* $\mathbf{c}$ *be an element* T_1*. Then* $\mathbf{c}$ *is generic with respect to the tuple* $(\mathcal{N}_1^{\lambda},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_n^{\lambda})$ *for any* $\lambda\in\mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof For any elements $\boldsymbol{c}_i\in T_1$, $(i=1,2)$ the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{c}_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{c}_2)$ are same. For any $\boldsymbol{c}\in S$ and for any $\lambda\in\mathbb{P}^1$, the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda_0}(\boldsymbol{c})$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{c})$ are same. Thus the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{c}_i)$ $(i=1,2)$ are same. Since T_1 is Zariski dense in $\boldsymbol{C}^l$, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{c}$ $(\boldsymbol{c}\in T_1)$ are generic with respect to the tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1^{\lambda},\ldots,\mathcal{N}_l^{\lambda})$. ■

Lemma 12.21 *For any* i*, we have* $\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}\cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c})\subset W_{h-1}(\boldsymbol{c})\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$.

Proof Due to Lemma 12.20, we may apply a lemma of Cattani-Kaplan (Proposition 1.9 in [7]. It is not difficult to prove directly.) ■

Lemma 12.22 *For any* i*, we have* $\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}\cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c})\subset W_{h-2}(\boldsymbol{c})\otimes\mathbb{T}(-1)$.

Proof We put $\theta=\sum f_i\cdot dz_i\cdot z_i^{-1}$, and we put ρ_i as in the page 156. We have the following inequality for some positive constant C, due to Simpson's Main estimate:

$$\big|(f_i-\rho_i)_{|C(\boldsymbol{c})}\big|_h\leq C\cdot|z|^{-1}\cdot\big(-\log|z|\big)^{-1}. \tag{256}$$

Let us consider the restriction of $\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}$ to the fibers over $0\in\mathbb{P}^1$. We denote the restriction by $\mathcal{N}_{i\,|\,0}^{\triangle}$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{i\,|\,0}^{\triangle}$ is given by $(f_i-\rho_i)_{(0,O)}$, we obtain $\mathcal{N}_{i\,|\,0}^{\triangle}\cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c})_{|0}\subset W_{h-2}(\boldsymbol{c})_{|0}$, due to (256) and the norm estimate in one dimensional case. Similarly, we obtain $\mathcal{N}_{i\,|\,\infty}^{\triangle}\cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c})_{|\infty}\subset W_{h-2}(\boldsymbol{c})_{|\infty}$.

Due to Lemma 12.21, we have $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle} \cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c}) \subset W_{h-1}(\boldsymbol{c}) \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$. Let us consider the induced morphism $\mathcal{N}^{\triangle} : \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(\boldsymbol{c})} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{h-1}^{W(\boldsymbol{c})} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$. We have already shown the vanishing of the induced morphism at $(x = 0, \infty)$. Note that $\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(\boldsymbol{c})}$ and $\mathrm{Gr}_{h-1}^{W(\boldsymbol{c})} \otimes \mathbb{T}(-1)$ are pure twistors of weight h and $h+1$ respectively. Thus the vanishing at $x = 0, \infty$ implies vanishing over $\mathbb{P}^1$. Thus we obtain the implication $\mathcal{N}_i \cdot W_h(\boldsymbol{c}) \subset W_{h-2}(\boldsymbol{c})$. ▮

Corollary 12.2 *For any element $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{C}^n$ which is generic with respect to the tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1^{\triangle}, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_n^{\triangle})$, we have $W(\boldsymbol{d}) = W(\boldsymbol{c})$, where $\boldsymbol{c}$ is taken as in Lemma* 12.18. ▮

12.2.3 Preliminary norm estimate

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let λ be generic, and we take a normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}$ and F.

We have the matrices $A^k \in M_r(\boldsymbol{C})$ $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$ determined as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda} \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} A^k \cdot \frac{dz_k}{z_k}.$$

Let f_{A_k} denote the endomorphism induced by A_k for the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$. We denote the nilpotent part of A_k by N_k. We impose the following assumption in this subsubsection.

Assumption 12.1 *The conjugacy classes of N_k are independent of $k = 1, \ldots, n$.* ▮

Under the assumption 12.1, we obtain the weight filtration $W^{(0)}$ of the vector bundle ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ induced by N_k, which is independent of a choice of k. We may assume that $\boldsymbol{v}$ is compatible with the filtration $W^{(0)}$. We put $b_i(v_j) := {}^i\deg^F(v_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{b}(v_j) = \big(b_i(v_j) \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, n\big)$. We put $\beta_i(v_j) = {}^i\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}(v_j) = \big(\beta_i(v_j) \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, n\big)$. We put $k(v_j) := \deg^W(v_j)$.

Then we obtain the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v_i')$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$, given as follows:

$$v_i' := v_i \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{n} |z_h|^{b_h(v_i)} \cdot \Big(-\sum_{h=1}^{n} \log |z_h|^2 \Big)^{-k(v_i)/2}.$$

Lemma 12.23 *The frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted over $X - D$.*

Proof We put as follows:

$$Y_m := \Big\{ (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in X - D \,\Big|\, |z_h| = 1,\ (h \leq m) \Big\}.$$

We consider the following claim:

(P_m): The restriction of the frame $\boldsymbol{v}'_{|Y_m}$ is adapted over Y_m.

We show the claim (P_m) by a descending induction on m. Since Y_n is compact, the claim (P_n) holds. We assume that (P_{m+1}) holds, and we will derive (P_m).

Let us pick the elements $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_a \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$ such that $\big\{ \mathfrak{k}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}_i) \,\big|\, i = 1, \ldots, a \big\} = \mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \underline{n})$. Then we have the generalized eigen decomposition $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} = \bigoplus_i \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ of f_{A_k} $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$. Here $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ denote the subbundle corresponding to the eigenvalues $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}_i) = \big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, q_1(\boldsymbol{u}_i)), \ldots, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, q_n(\boldsymbol{u}_i)) \big)$. Correspondingly we have the decomposition of the endomorphisms f_{A_m}:

$$f_{A_m} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}_i} \Big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, q_m(\boldsymbol{u}_i)) + N_{m\, \boldsymbol{u}_i} \Big).$$

We take the model bundle $Mod(N_{m\, \boldsymbol{u}_i})$ corresponding to the nilpotent map $N_{m\, \boldsymbol{u}_i}$. We obtain the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, the metric $h_{1\, \boldsymbol{u}_i}$, and the canonical frame $\boldsymbol{v}_{1\, \boldsymbol{u}_i}$.

Let ϕ be the holomorphic map $X \longrightarrow \Delta$ given by $(z_1,\ldots,z_n)\longmapsto \prod_{i=1}^{n} z_i$. Then we obtain the harmonic bundle $\phi^{-1}Mod(N_{\boldsymbol{u}_i})$, the deformed holomorphic bundle $\phi^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, the metric $h_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, and the canonical frame $\phi^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_i$, over $X-D$.

On the other hand, we have the model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{u}_i)$ over $X-D$ of rank 1. We obtain the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{L}^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{u}_i)$, the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{2\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, the metric $h_{2\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}$, and the canonical frame $e_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$.

Then we obtain the following:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}_i} := \mathcal{L}^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{u}_i)\otimes\phi^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i},\ \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}_i} := \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{2}\otimes\phi^{-1}\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{1},\ h_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}_i} := h_{2\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}\otimes\phi^{-1}h_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}_i},\ \boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}_i} := e_{\boldsymbol{u}_0}\otimes\phi^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}.$$

By taking a direct sum, we obtain $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0$, $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_0$, h_0 and $\boldsymbol{v}_0$.

Moreover, by taking the dz_m-component, we obtain the λ-connections $\mathfrak{q}_m(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_0)$ and $\mathfrak{q}_m(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})$ along the z_m-direction. Note the following relations due to our construction:

$$\mathfrak{q}_m(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda})\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v}\cdot A_m\cdot\frac{dz_m}{z_m},\qquad \mathfrak{q}_m(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_0)\boldsymbol{v}_0 = \boldsymbol{v}_0\cdot A_m\cdot\frac{dz_m}{z_m}. \tag{257}$$

Let consider the morphism $\Phi:\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0\longrightarrow\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ given by the frames $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$. The equalities (257) implies that Φ is flat with respect to the λ-connections along the z_m-direction. Moreover, the restriction $\Phi_{|Y_{m+1}}$ and the inverse $\Phi^{-1}_{|Y_{m+1}}$ are bounded, due to our assumption of the induction. Thus we obtain the boundedness of $\Phi_{|Y_m}$ and the inverse. Then it is easy to derive the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ on Y_m and the induction can proceed. See the subsection 6.1 in [38] for more detail of the argument. ■

12.2.4 Preliminary constantness of the filtrations

We use the setting in the subsubsection 12.2.3. Let us pick the elements $\boldsymbol{u}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{u}_a\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$ such that $\big\{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}_i)\,\big|\,i=1,\ldots,a\big\}=\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda},\underline{n})$. Then we have the generalized eigen decomposition ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}=\bigoplus_i {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ of f_{A_k} $(k=1,\ldots,n)$. Here ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ denote the subbundle corresponding to the eigenvalues $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}_i)=\big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,q_1(\boldsymbol{u}_i)),\ldots,\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,q_n(\boldsymbol{u}_i))\big)$. Correspondingly we have the decomposition of A_k:

$$A_k=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}\Big(\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,q_k(\boldsymbol{u}_i)\big)+N_{k\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}\Big).$$

The frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ induces the frame $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{a}$ be any element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$. Let $\mathbb{H}$ denote the upper half plane $\{\zeta\mid\operatorname{Im}(\zeta)>0\}$. We put $y:=-\operatorname{Im}(\zeta)$. Let us consider the following morphism $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}:\mathbb{H}\longrightarrow X-D$, given by $z_i=\exp\big(\sqrt{-1}\cdot a_i\cdot\zeta\big)$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$. We obtain the harmonic bundle $\psi^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{a}}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$. We have the deformed holomorphic bundle $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}_i}$. We have the holomorphic frame $\boldsymbol{w}_{\boldsymbol{u}}:=\psi^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{a}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}})$. We have the following relation:

$$\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{w}_{\boldsymbol{u}}=\boldsymbol{w}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\cdot\Big(\sum_k\sqrt{-1}a_k\cdot A^k_{\boldsymbol{u}}\Big)\cdot d\zeta=\boldsymbol{w}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\cdot\sum_k a_k\cdot\Big(\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,q_k(\boldsymbol{u})\big)+N_{\boldsymbol{u},k}\Big)\cdot\sqrt{-1}\cdot d\zeta. \tag{258}$$

We put $N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a})=\sum_i a_iN_{\boldsymbol{u},i}$, and we take a model bundle $Mod(N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a}))$ on Δ^*_z for $N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a})$. We put $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}):=\sum_k a_k\cdot q_k(\boldsymbol{u})$, and we take a model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))$ on Δ^*_z. We put $E_{1,\boldsymbol{u}}:=L(\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))\otimes Mod(N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a}))$, and we denote the deformed holomorphic bundle by $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1,\boldsymbol{u}}$. We have the metric $h_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ on $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1,\boldsymbol{u}}$. We have the normalizing frame $\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, such that the following relation holds on Δ^*_z:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}=\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}\cdot\big(\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)+N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)\cdot\frac{dz}{z}.$$

Let ϕ denote the holomorphic map $\mathbb{H}\longrightarrow\Delta^*$ given by $z=\exp(\sqrt{-1}\zeta)$. We put $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}:=\phi^*\mathcal{E}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and the pull backs of $h_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, and $\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ are denoted by $h_{0,\boldsymbol{u}}$, $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ respectively. On the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$, we have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}\phi^*(\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}})=\phi^*(\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}})\cdot\big(\mathfrak{e}\big(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)+N_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)\cdot\sqrt{-1}d\zeta. \tag{259}$$

Then we have the isomorphism $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u}}:\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}\longrightarrow\psi^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ given by the frames $\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. Then $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\Phi^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ are compatible with λ-connections, due to (258) and (259).

We put $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0 := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}_i} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$. We have the induced metric h_0. We obtain the isomorphism $\Phi := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Phi_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ from $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0$ to $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. Then Φ and Φ^{-1} are compatible with the λ-connections. We regard them as the flat sections of $Hom\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0, \psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)$ and $Hom\bigl(\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0\bigr)$. The metrics h_0 and $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}h$ induce the metrics h_2 and h_3 of $Hom\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0, \psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\bigr)$ and $Hom\bigl(\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0\bigr)$.

Lemma 12.24 *We have the following estimate for some positive constants* C_1 *and* C_2*:*

$$\max\Bigl\{\log|\Phi|_{h_2},\ \log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_3}\Bigr\} \leq C_1 + C_2 \cdot \log y. \tag{260}$$

Proof For each element $v_i \in \boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, we put as follows:

$$v'_i := v_i \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, q_j(\boldsymbol{u}))}.$$

Then $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v'_i)$ is C^{∞}-frame of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ over $X - D$, which is adapted up to log order. In particular, we have the following inequality on $\mathbb{H}$, for some positive constants C_i $(i = 1, 2)$ and M:

$$C_1 \cdot y^{-M} \leq H(h, \psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}') \leq C_2 \cdot y^{M}$$

We also have the following equality for $v_i \in \boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$:

$$\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1} v'_i = w_i \cdot \exp\Bigl(-y \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))\Bigr).$$

On the other hand, we put as follows, for $v_{1\,j} \in \boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$:

$$v'_{1\,j} := v_{1\,j} \cdot |z|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))}.$$

Then the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'_1 = (v'_{1\,j})$ of $\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ is adapted up to log order. We put $v'_{0\,j} := \phi^{-1} v'_{1\,j}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}'_0 := (v'_{0\,j})$. Then we obtain the following inequalities for some positive constants C'_i $(i = 1, 2)$ and M':

$$C'_1 \cdot y^{-M'} \leq H(h_0, \boldsymbol{v}'_0) \leq C'_2 \cdot y^{M'}.$$

We also have the following equality, for $v_{0\,i} \in \boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$:

$$v'_{0\,i} = v_{0\,i} \cdot \exp\Bigl(-y \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))\Bigr).$$

Since Φ and Φ^{-1} are given by the frames $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, we obtain the estimate $\max\bigl\{|\Phi|_{h_2}, |\Phi^{-1}|_{h_3}\bigr\} \leq C'' \cdot y^{M''}$ for some positive constants C'' and M''. Thus we are done. ∎

Lemma 12.25 *The functions* $\log|\Phi|_{h_2}$ *and* $\log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_3}$ *are subharmonic. Namely we have the following inequalities:*

$$\Delta \log|\Phi|^2_{h_2} \leq 0, \qquad \Delta \log|\Phi^{-1}|^2_{h_3} \leq 0. \tag{261}$$

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [50]. ∎

The functions $\log|\Phi|^2_{h_2}$ and $\log|\Phi^{-1}|^2_{h_3}$ can be regarded as follows: We have the holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_1 := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}_i} \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}_i}$ on Δ^*. We also have the frame $\boldsymbol{v}_1$ induced by the frames $\boldsymbol{v}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$. We denote the projection of $\Delta^* \times (X - D)$ onto the i-th component by q_i. We have the holomorphic bundles $q_1^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_1$ and $q_2^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. The frames $\boldsymbol{v}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ give the isomorphisms Φ' and Φ'^{-1} of $q_1^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_1$ and $q_2^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$. The metrics h_1 and h induce the metrics h'_2 and h'_3 of the bundles $Hom(q_1^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_1, q_2^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ and $Hom(q_2^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, q_1^{*}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_1)$. The morphisms ϕ and $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ induce the morphism $F : \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \Delta^* \times (X - D)$. Then we have the following equalities:

$$\log|\Phi|^2_{h_2} = F^{-1}\Bigl(\log|\Phi'|^2_{h'_2}\Bigr), \qquad \log|\Phi^{-1}|^2_{h_3} = F^{-1}\Bigl(\log|\Phi'^{-1}|^2_{h'_3}\Bigr). \tag{262}$$

We obtain the functions $G_1 := \Xi\bigl(\log|\Phi|_{h_2}\bigr)$ and $G_2 := \Xi\bigl(\log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_3}\bigr)$ on $\boldsymbol{R}_{>0}$ (the subsubsection 2.4.1).

Lemma 12.26 *There exists a positive constants C such that the following inequality holds on the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$:*

$$\max\big\{G_1, G_2\big\} \leq C.$$

Proof It follows from (261), (262), Lemma 2.14 that the functions G_i $(i = 1, 2)$ are convex below. Then Lemma 12.26 follows from (260) and Lemma 2.15. ∎

We take the metric $h_{4\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ of $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. For any $w_i, w_j \in \boldsymbol{w}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, we put as follows:

$$h_{4\,\boldsymbol{u}}(w_i, w_j) = \delta_{i\,j} \cdot \exp\Big(2 \cdot y \cdot \mathfrak{p}\big(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)\Big) \cdot y^{k(v_i)}.$$

Here $\delta_{i\,j}$ denotes 1 in the case $(i = j)$ and 0 in the case $i \neq j$. Recall that we put $k(v_i) := \deg^{W}(v_i)$. Taking the direct sum of $h_{4\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, we have the induced metric h_4 of $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$.

Lemma 12.27 *The metrics $\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}h$ and h_4 are mutually bounded*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 12.23. ∎

We have the weight filtration $W^{(1)}$ on $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ induced by the logarithms of the monodromy. We take the normalizing frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, which is compatible with $W^{(1)}$. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ denote the pull back of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ via the morphism ϕ. We take the metric $h_{5\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$. For any $\tilde{v}_{0\,i}, \tilde{v}_{0\,j} \in \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0\,\boldsymbol{u}}$, we put as follows:

$$h_{5\,\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\tilde{v}_{0\,i}, \tilde{v}_{0\,j}\big) = \delta_{i\,j} \cdot \exp\Big(2 \cdot y \cdot \mathfrak{p}\big(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a})\big)\Big) \cdot y^{k(\tilde{v}_{0\,i})}.$$

Then we have the induced metric h_5 of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0$, and the metrics h_5 and h_0 are mutually bounded.

The metrics h_4 and h_5 induce the metrics h_6 and h_7 of $Hom(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0, \psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$ and $Hom(\psi_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)$. Then h_6 and h_2 are mutually bounded, and h_7 and h_3 are mutually bounded. Hence we obtain the following inequality on $\mathbb{H}$, for some positive constants C_4:

$$\max\Big\{\Xi(\log|\Phi|^2_{h_6},), \Xi(\log|\Phi^{-1}|^2_{h_7})\Big\} \leq C_4.$$

Since the functions $\log|\Phi|_{h_6}$ and $\log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_7}$ are independent of the real part of ζ, we have the equalities $\Xi(\log|\Phi|_{h_6}) = \log|\Phi|_{h_6}$ and $\Xi(\log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_7}) = \log|\Phi^{-1}|_{h_7}$. Thus we obtain the following inequalities on $\mathbb{H}$, for some positive constant C_5:

$$\max\Big\{|\Phi|_{h_6},\ |\Phi^{-1}|_{h_7}\Big\} \leq C_5. \tag{263}$$

Lemma 12.28 *Under Assumption* 12.1, *the weight filtration of $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \sum a_i \cdot \mathcal{N}^{\lambda}_i$ are independent of a choice of $\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1$.*

Proof Let f be a holomorphic section of ${}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$. It gives the section of $W^{(1)}_k\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{1\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ if and only if we have the following estimate:

$$\big|\phi^* f\big|_{h_{5\,\boldsymbol{u}}} = O\Big(\exp\big(-y \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))\big) \cdot y^{k/2}\Big). \tag{264}$$

Since $h_{4\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $h_{5\,\boldsymbol{u}}$ are mutually bounded, (264) is equivalent to the following:

$$\big|\phi^* f\big|_{h_{5\,\boldsymbol{u}}} = O\Big(\exp\big(-y \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{a}))\big) \cdot y^{k/2}\Big).$$

It is equivalent to $\phi^* f$ gives the section of $W^{(0)}_k\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big)$. Since $W^{(1)}_k$ is the weight filtration of $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{a})$, we obtain the result. ∎

12.2.5 Constantness of the filtration at generic λ

Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle. Let λ be generic, and $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a normalizing frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$, compatible with F and $\mathbb{E}$. We put $b_i(v_j)={}^i\deg^F(v_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{b}(v_j)=(b_i(v_j)\,|\,i=1,\dots,n)$. We put $\beta_i(v_j)={}^i\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_j)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}(v_i)=(\beta_i(v_j)\,|\,i=1,\dots,n)$.

Then we obtain the matrices $A^k\in M_r(\boldsymbol{C})$ determined as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}^\lambda\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\sum_{k=1}^n A^k\frac{d\zeta_k}{\zeta_k}.$$

We denote the nilpotent part of A_k by N_k.

Let us pick $\boldsymbol{c}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{c}_n\in\mathbb{Z}^n_{>0}$. We denote the tuple $(\boldsymbol{c}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{c}_n)$ by $\boldsymbol{C}$. Let $\phi_{\boldsymbol{C}}:X\longrightarrow X$ be the morphism as follows:

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{C}}^{-1}(\zeta_k)=\prod_{j=1}^n z_h^{c_{h\,k}}.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{C}}^{-1}\Bigl(\sum A^k\frac{d\zeta_k}{\zeta_k}\Bigr)=\sum_{h=1}^n\Bigl(\sum_{k=1}^n c_{h\,k}\cdot A^k\Bigr)\frac{dz_h}{z_h}.$$

We put $\boldsymbol{c}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{b}(v_j):=\sum c_{h\,i}\cdot b_i(v_j)$. We decompose as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{c}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{b}(v_j)=n_{h\,j}+\kappa_{h\,j},\qquad n_{h\,j}\in\mathbb{Z},\ \ -1<\kappa_{h\,j}\leq 0.$$

We put $\tilde{v}_j:=v_j\cdot\prod_{h=1}^n z^{n_{h\,j}}$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}=(\tilde{v}_j)$. Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is a normalizing frame of ${}^\diamond\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. We have $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}=\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\cdot\sum_h\tilde{A}^h\cdot dz_h/z_h$ for $\tilde{A}^h\in M_r(\boldsymbol{C})$. The components $\tilde{A}^h_{i\,j}$ is given as follows:

$$\tilde{A}^h_{i\,j}=\sum_k c_{h\,k}\cdot A^k_{i\,j}+\delta_{i\,j}\cdot n_{h\,j}.$$

Hence the nilpotent part $\tilde{N}_h$ of $\tilde{A}^h$ is given by $N(\boldsymbol{c}_h):=\sum c_{h\,k}\cdot N_k$. If $\boldsymbol{c}_h$ $(h=1,\dots,n)$ are generic with respect to the tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1,\dots,\mathcal{N}_n)$, then the conjugacy classes of $\tilde{N}_h$ are independent of $h=1,\dots,n$.

Lemma 12.29 *The weight filtration of* $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{a})$ *are independent of a choice of* $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$.

Proof We can pick generic elements $\boldsymbol{c}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{c}_n\in\mathbb{Z}^n_{>0}$, such that $\boldsymbol{a}=\sum a'_h\boldsymbol{c}_h$ for some $\boldsymbol{a}'=(a'_h)\in\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$. We have the following relation:

$$N(\boldsymbol{a})=\sum_k a_kN_k=\sum_{k,h}c_{h\,k}\cdot a'_h\cdot N_k=\sum_h a'_h\cdot N(\boldsymbol{c}_h).$$

Thus Lemma 12.29 can be reduced to Lemma 12.28. ∎

12.2.6 Theorem (the higher dimensional case)

Let V be a pure twistor of weight n. Let $S:V\otimes\sigma(V)\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(-n)$ denote the $(-1)^n$-symmetric pairing. We say that S is a semi-polarization, if the induced hermitian pairing on $H^0\bigl(\mathbb{P}^1,V\otimes\mathcal{O}(-n)\bigr)$ is positive semi-definite.

We have the induced pairing $S:P_h\operatorname{Gr}^W_{-h}S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes P_h\operatorname{Gr}^W_h S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\longrightarrow\mathbb{T}(0)$.

Lemma 12.30 *For any* $\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$, $S\bigl(N(\boldsymbol{d})^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)$ *gives a semi-polarization on* $P\operatorname{Gr}^W_h$. *Here* $P\operatorname{Gr}^W_h$ *denotes the primitive part for* $N(\boldsymbol{d})$.

Proof Let q_i denote the projection of $\mathbb{P}^1\times\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$ onto the i-th component. We have the C^∞-vector bundle $q_1^*\operatorname{Gr}^W_h$ on $\mathbb{P}^1\times\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$. Since the conjugacy classes of $N(\boldsymbol{a})$ $(\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0})$ are independent of a choice of $\boldsymbol{a}$, we obtain the vector bundle $Pq_1^*\operatorname{Gr}^W_h$, by taking the primitive parts for $N(\boldsymbol{a})$. For generic $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{Q}^n$, the pairing $S\bigl(N(\boldsymbol{d})^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)$ gives the polarization, due to Theorem 12.1. Then it follows that the pairing $S\bigl(N(\boldsymbol{d})^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)$ is a semi-polarization for any elements $\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$. ∎

Lemma 12.31 *The conjugacy classes of* $N(\boldsymbol{d})$ *are independent of a choice of* $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$*. In particular,* $W(\boldsymbol{a}) = W(\boldsymbol{a}')$ *for any* $\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{a}' \in \boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$*.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 12.29. ∎

Corollary 12.3 *For any element* $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n_{>0}$*,* $S\bigl(N(\boldsymbol{d})^h \otimes \mathrm{id}\bigr)$ *gives a polarization on the primitive part* $P\,\mathrm{Gr}^W_h$ *for* $N(\boldsymbol{d})$*.*

Proof Due to Lemma 12.31, the pairing $S\bigl(N(\boldsymbol{a})^h \otimes \mathrm{id}\bigr)$ is perfect. Then it gives the polarization due to Lemma 12.30. ∎

Corollary 12.4 *The tuple* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E), W^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle\,(0)}, S^{(0)})$ *is a split nilpotent orbit. Here* $\boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle\,(0)}$ *denotes the tuple* $(N_1^{\triangle}, \ldots, N_l^{\triangle})$*.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 12.3. ∎

Theorem 12.2 *The tuples* $(S^{\mathrm{can}}_u(E), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S)$ *and* $(S_u(E,P), W, \boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}, S)$ $(P \in X - D)$ *are polarized mixed twistor structures of* $(0,l)$*-type. Here* $\boldsymbol{N}^{\triangle}$ *denotes the tuple of nilpotent maps* $\mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}$ $(i \in \underline{l})$*.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 12.4 and Lemma 3.30. ∎

12.3 Some consequences

12.3.1 Strong sequential compatibility on $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ and $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$

From a harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ over $X - D$, we obtain the polarized limiting mixed twistor structure

$$(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E), \mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}, S), \quad (S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P), \mathcal{N}_i^{\triangle}, S).$$

Corollary 12.5 *The tuple of nilpotent maps* $(\mathcal{N}_1^{\triangle}, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_n^{\triangle})$ *on* $S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ *or* $S_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E,P)$ *is strongly sequentially compatible.*

Proof It follows from Theorem 12.2 and Lemma 3.75. ∎

Remark 12.3 *From the associated graded mixed twistor structure* $(\mathrm{Gr}^W S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E), W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$*, we obtain the patched objects, which gives the harmonic bundle. In the case where* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ *is nilpotent and with trivial parabolic structure, it is same as the limiting CVHS in our previous paper.* ∎

Remark 12.4 *From the limiting mixed twistor structure* $(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E), \mathcal{N}_i, S)$*, we obtain the variation of* $\mathbb{P}^1$*-holomorphic bundle* $\mathcal{V}$*. We also obtain the pairing* $\mathcal{V} \otimes \sigma(\mathcal{V}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$*. Does it give a variation of polarized pure twistor structures? If it is true, it gives a partial generalization of Schmid's nilpotent orbit theorem.*

The replacement of a variation of Hodge structures to the nilpotent orbit seems fundamental in the study of Cattani-Kaplan-Schmid and Kashiwara-Kawai. In this study, we do not use such replacement. ∎

Corollary 12.6 *Let* $\boldsymbol{a}$ *be an element of* $\mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0}$ *On* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$*, the conjugacy classes of* $\prod_i \mathcal{N}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)}^{a_i}$ *is independent of a choice of* $(\lambda, P) \in \boldsymbol{C} \times D_{\underline{l}}$*.*

Proof When we fix a point $P \in D_{\underline{l}}$, the independence follows from the fact that $\prod_i \mathcal{N}_i^{a_i}$ induces the morphisms of mixed twistor structures. When we fix $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$, we can derive the independence by using the normalizing frame. ∎

Similarly we can show the following:

Lemma 12.32 *Let* $\boldsymbol{a}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{b}$ *be elements of* $\mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0}$*. Then* $\mathrm{Im} \prod_{i=1} \mathcal{N}_i^{a_i} \cap \mathrm{Ker} \prod_{i=1} \mathcal{N}_i^{b_i}$ *gives the vector subbundle of* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ *on* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$*.* ∎

Corollary 12.7 *On* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$*, the tuple of nilpotent maps* $\mathcal{N}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_l$ *are strongly sequentially compatible.*

Proof This is a direct corollary of Corollary 12.5. ∎

12.3.2 Sequential compatibility of the tuple $\bigl(\mathcal{N}_i, {}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}, {}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$

Let λ_0 be an element of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Let ϵ_0 be a sufficiently small positive number. Then we may assume that ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ is locally free, and that we have ${}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}$, ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ on ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i}$. We have already known that the tuple $\bigl({}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}, {}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \bigm| i = 1, \ldots, l\bigr)$ is compatible in the sense of Definition 4.17.

Lemma 12.33 *Let P be a point of $D^\circ_{\underline{m}} = D_{\underline{m}} - \bigcup_{i>m}(D_i \cap D_{\underline{m}})$.*

- *For any $m_1 \leq m$, the tuple $(\mathcal{N}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_{m_1}, {}^{m_1+1}F^{(\lambda_0)}, \ldots, {}^mF^{(\lambda_0)})$ is sequentially compatible on the bundle $\underline{{}^{m_1}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F(\lambda_0)}\, \underline{{}^{m_1}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|P\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$.*

- *Let $\boldsymbol{a}$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^{m_1}_{\geq 0}$. The conjugacy classes of $\prod_i \mathcal{N}^{a_i}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ on $\underline{{}^{m_1}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\, \underline{{}^{m}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|(\lambda,P)}\bigr)$ are independent of a choice of $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.*

Proof We know that $\underline{{}^{m}}\mathcal{N}_1$, …, $\underline{{}^{m}}\mathcal{N}_m$ are sequentially compatible on $\underline{{}^{m}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\, \underline{{}^{m}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|P\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and their conjugacy classes are independent of a choice of λ (Corollary 12.6 and Corollary 12.7).

On $\Delta^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, the vector bundle $\underline{{}^{m_1}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\, \underline{{}^{m}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|P\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is decomposed into the generalized eigen bundles of the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ $(i = m_1 + 1, \ldots, m)$. It satisfies the following:

- The decomposition gives the splitting of the filtrations ${}^iF$ $(i = m_1 + 1, \ldots, m)$.

- The decomposition is compatible with $\mathcal{N}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m_1)$.

For any $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, let $\mathcal{R}$ denote the local ring of $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ at λ. We put as follows:

$$V = \underline{{}^{m_1}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\, \underline{{}^{m}}\mathbb{E}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|P\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}} \mathcal{R}.$$

Then we obtain the naturally induced filtrations ${}^iF$ $(i = m_1 + 1, \ldots, m)$ and the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m_1)$. Then we have only to apply Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.1. ▮

On $D_{\underline{m}}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the vector bundle $\underline{{}^{m}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\, \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{m}}}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\mathcal{N}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_m$.

Lemma 12.34

- *Let $\boldsymbol{a}$ be an element of $\mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0}$. The conjugacy classes of $\prod_i \mathcal{N}^{a_i}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ are independent of a choice of $(\lambda, P) \in \mathcal{D}_{\underline{m}}$.*

- *The tuple of the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_m$ is sequentially compatible.*

Proof Let P be a point of $D_{\underline{m}}$. We have already seen the result on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \{P\}$.

We put $I_{\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,(\lambda,P)} := \bigcap_{j=1}^m W(\underline{j})_{h_j\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$, and then we have only to show that $\bigl\{I_{\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,(\lambda,P)} \bigm| (\lambda, P) \in \mathcal{D}_{\underline{m}}\bigr\}$ forms a vector bundle. For that purpose, we have only to show that the ranks of $I_{\boldsymbol{h}\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ are independent of (λ, P).

If we fix P, then they are independent of a choice of λ due to the previous lemma.

Let pick a generic λ. Then we have a normalizing frame for ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ Due to the normalizing frame, we obtain the isomorphism for any $P_1, P_2 \in D_{\underline{m}}$:

$$\bigl({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|P_1}, \mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^\lambda) \bigm| i \in \underline{m}\bigr) \simeq \bigl({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda{}_{|P_2}, \mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}^\lambda) \bigm| i \in \underline{m}\bigr).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

We obtain the tuple $\bigl(\mathcal{N}_i, {}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}, {}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$ as in the subsubsection 4.5.3.

Theorem 12.3 *The tuple $\bigl(\mathcal{N}_i, {}^iF^{(\lambda_0)}, {}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \bigm| i \in \underline{l}\bigr)$ is sequentially compatible.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 12.34. ▮

12.3.3 Decomposition

First we have a remark.

Remark 12.5 *Let P be a point of D_I°. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, I)$. Let $q_I : X \longrightarrow D_I$ be the projection. By considering the restriction of $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ to $q_I^{-1}(P)$, we obtain the Pol-MTS $(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{\mathrm{can}}, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$ of type $(0, |I|)$. Note that we can apply Proposition 3.8 to the tuple $(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{\mathrm{can}}, W, \boldsymbol{N}, S)$.*

Let us consider the vector bundle ${}^I\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ and the nilpotent maps $\mathcal{N}_i$ $(i \in I)$ on $\mathcal{D}_I$. Let J and K be subsets of I such that $J \cap K = \emptyset$. We put $\mathcal{N}_K := \prod_{k \in K} \mathcal{N}_k$. Due to the limiting mixed twistor theorem, the conjugacy classes of $\mathcal{N}_{K\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ are independent of $(\lambda, P) \in \mathcal{D}_I$. Thus we obtain the vector bundle $\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{N}_K)$. For any element $i \in J$, we put $J' := J - \{i\}$. We have the morphisms $\mathrm{var}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{J'}(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K)$ and $\mathrm{can}_i : \mathcal{V}_{J'}(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K)$ For any element $i \in K$, we put $K' := K - \{i\}$. We have the morphisms $\mathrm{var}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_{K'})$ and $\mathrm{can}_i : \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_{K'}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K)$ (See the subsubsection 3.9.4).

Lemma 12.35 *Let P be a point of D_i°. Then we have the following decomposition:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{N}_K)))_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{P\}} = \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{can}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{P\}} \oplus \mathrm{Ker}\,\mathrm{var}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{P\}}\,.$$

Proof We have only to apply the limiting mixed twistor theorem and Proposition 3.8. (See Remark (12.5)). ▮

Lemma 12.36 *Let P be a point of D_I.*

- *The numbers* $\dim \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)})$ *and* $\dim \mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)})$ *are independent of* λ.
- *We have the decomposition* $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K))_{|(P,\lambda)} = \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{can}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{P\}} \oplus \mathrm{Ker}\,\mathrm{var}_{i\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{P\}}$.

Proof We have the subset $I_0 \subset \underline{l}$ such that $P \in D_K^{\circ}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_1$ be any element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, I_0)$. The ranks of can_i and var_i on ${}^{I_0}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}$ are independent of λ due to the limiting mixed twistor theorem, and we have the decomposition of ${}^{I_0}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}$. Then we have only to apply Lemma 5.8. ▮

Proposition 12.3 *We have the decomposition of the vector bundle:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\mathcal{V}_J(\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_K)) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i).$$

Proof We have only to show that $\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i)$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i)$ are vector bundles. Namely we have only to show the ranks of the morphisms $\mathrm{can}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ and $\mathrm{var}_{i\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ are independent of $(\lambda, P) \in \mathcal{D}_i$. When we fix a point P, it follows from Lemma 12.36. When we pick a generic λ, we can show the numbers are independent of P by using the normalizing frame. (See the last part of the proof of Lemma 12.34.) ▮

12.3.4 The induced polarized pure twistor structure

Let us consider the case $l = n = |I|$. Due to the limiting mixed twistor theorem and Kashiwara's lemma (Corollary 3.16), we obtain the polarized mixed twistor structure of type $(n-1, n+1)$:

$$\big(\mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{\mathrm{can}}), W, \boldsymbol{N}, \mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}(S)\big).$$

Lemma 12.37 *We put as follows:*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}} := \mathrm{Ker}\Big(P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,\mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{\mathrm{can}}(E)) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{|I|=n-1} P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,\mathcal{V}_I(S_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{\mathrm{can}}(E))\Big).$$

Then $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}}$ is pure twistor of weight $h + n - 1$. The pairing $\mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}(S)(N^h \otimes \mathrm{id})$ gives the polarization of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}}$.

Proof It follows from Saito's lemma (Lemma 3.93). ▮

13 Norm estimate

13.1 Preliminary

13.1.1 The λ-connection form for pull back

We put $X = \Delta_{\zeta}^{n}$, and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let λ_0 be a point and ϵ_0 be a sufficiently small number. We assume that we have $({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{D})$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. For each v_i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$ such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i))$. We put as follows:

$$v_i' := v_i \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} |\zeta_j|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i))}, \qquad \boldsymbol{v}' = (v_i').$$

We pick any element $\boldsymbol{c} := \bigl(c_{j\,i} \,|\, j \in \underline{m}, i \in \underline{n}\bigr) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{m \cdot n}$. We put $\tilde{X} = \Delta^m$. Then we have the morphism $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}} : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ determined as follows:

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\zeta_i = \prod_{j=1}^{m} z_j^{c_{j\,i}}.$$

Then we obtain the C^{∞}-frame $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\boldsymbol{v}'$ of $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}$ over $\tilde{X} - \tilde{D}$, which is adapted up to log order. We have the following equalities:

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}(v_i') = \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}(v_i) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} \Bigl(\prod_{h=1}^{m} |z_h|^{c_{h\,j}} \Bigr)^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_j(v_i)} = \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}(v_i) \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} |z_h|^{\mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda, \sum c_{h\,j} \cdot u_j(v_i)\bigr)} = \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}(v_i) \times \prod_{h=1}^{m} |z_h|^{\mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda, \boldsymbol{c}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\bigr)}.$$

Here we put $\boldsymbol{c}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i) = \sum c_{h\,j} \cdot u_j(v_i)$.

For some small positive number ϵ_0' such that $\epsilon_0' < \epsilon_0$, we may assume that $\nu\bigl(\mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda, \boldsymbol{c}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\bigr)\bigr)$ does not independent of $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')$ for any v_i and for any h. We put $\nu(v_i, h) := \nu\bigl(\mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda, \boldsymbol{c}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\bigr)\bigr) \in \mathbb{Z}$. (See the subsubsection 2.1.5). We put $\kappa(v_i, h) := \kappa\bigl(\mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda, \boldsymbol{c}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\bigr)\bigr)$. Then we put as follows:

$$u_i := \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_i \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} z_h^{\nu(v_i, h)}.$$

Then u_i is a holomorphic section of ${}^{\diamond}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}$. We put as follows:

$$u_i' := u_i \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} |z_h|^{\kappa(v_i, h)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}' := (u_i').$$

Then $\boldsymbol{u}'$ is adapted up to log order over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0') - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')$, by our construction. Hence $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_i)$ is a holomorphic frame of ${}^{\diamond}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with the filtrations $F^{(\lambda_0)}$, due to Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5. We also have the following:

$$^{h}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(u_i) = \kappa\bigl(v_i, h\bigr). \tag{265}$$

Let $A = \sum_k A^k \cdot \zeta_k^{-1} \cdot d\zeta_k$ denote the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e., $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot A$ holds. We put $\tilde{\mathbb{D}} := \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathbb{D}^{*}$. Then we have the following equalities:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{D}}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_i = \sum_j \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_k \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}A_{j\,i}^{k} \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\frac{d\zeta_k}{\zeta_k} \Bigr) = \sum_j \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_h \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \cdot \sum_k c_{h\,k} \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}A_{j\,i}^{k} \Bigr).$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{D}}u_i &= \tilde{\mathbb{D}}\Bigl(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_i \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} z_h^{\nu(v_i,h)} \Bigr) = \tilde{\mathbb{D}}\bigl(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_i\bigr) \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} z_h^{\nu(v_i,h)} + \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}v_i \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} z_h^{\nu(v_i,h)} \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h=1}^{m} \nu(v_i, h) \cdot \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \Bigr) \\ &= \sum_j u_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h=1}^{m} \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{h\,k} \cdot \phi^{*}A_{j\,i}^{k} \Bigr) \cdot \prod_{h=1}^{m} z^{\nu(v_i,h) - \nu(v_j,h)} + u_i \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h=1}^{m} \nu(v_i, h) \cdot \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \Bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{266}$$

13.1.2 Diagonal case

Let us consider the case that $\boldsymbol{c}$ is a diagonal matrix whose i-th diagonal component is c_i, that is, $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\zeta_i = z_i^{c_i}$. Then we obtain the following formula from (266):

$$\tilde{\mathbb{D}}u_i = \sum_j u_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h=1}^{m} \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \cdot c_h \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*} A^{h}_{j\,i}\Bigr) \cdot \prod_{p=1}^{m} z^{\nu(c_p \cdot b_p(v_i)) - \nu(c_p \cdot b_p(v_j))} + u_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{m} \nu(c_h \cdot b_h(v_i)) \cdot \frac{dz_h}{z_h}$$
$$=: \sum u_j \cdot \tilde{A}^{h}_{j\,i} \frac{dz_h}{z_h}. \qquad (267)$$

Here we put $b_p(v_i) := \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_p(v_i))$.

Lemma 13.1 *We have the following vanishings:*

1. *In the case* ${}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) < {}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$, *we have* $\tilde{A}^{h}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} = 0$, *for any* h.
2. *If* c_k *is sufficiently large and if the inequality* ${}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) > {}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$ *holds, then we have* $\tilde{A}^{h}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} = 0$.

Proof In the case ${}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) < {}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$, we have $A^{h}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} = 0$. Hence $A^{h}_{j\,i} \cdot \zeta_k^{-1}$ is holomorphic, and thus $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*} A^{h}_{j\,i} \cdot z_k^{-c_k}$ is holomorphic. Since we have the following inequality: $-c_k < \nu\bigl(c_k \cdot b_k(v_i)\bigr) - \nu\bigl(c_k \cdot b_k(v_j)\bigr)$, we obtain the first claim.

Let us show the second claim. If c_k is sufficiently large and the inequality ${}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) > {}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)$ holds, then we obtain the inequality $\nu(c_k \cdot b_k(v_i)) > \nu(c_k \cdot b_k(v_j))$. Since $A^{k}_{j\,i}$ is holomorphic, we obtain the result. ∎

Assume that c_k $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ are sufficiently large. Then we have the following formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}_k(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})u_i = \sum u_j \cdot \tilde{A}^{k}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} = u_i \cdot \nu(c_k \cdot b_k(v_i)) + \sum_{{}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = {}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j)} u_j \cdot c_k \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c},k}^{*}(A^{k}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k}) \cdot \prod_{a \neq k} z_a^{\nu(c_a \cdot b_a(v_i)) - \nu(c_a \cdot b_a(v_j))}. \qquad (268)$$

Here $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c},k} : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_k$ denotes the restriction of ϕ to $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k$, given by $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c},k}^{*}\zeta_i = z_i^{c_i}$ for $i \neq k$.

We obtain the λ-connection ${}^{k}\tilde{\mathbb{D}}$ of ${}^{\diamond}\psi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')}$, given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{k}\tilde{\mathbb{D}}u_i &= \sum_j u_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h \neq k} \tilde{A}^{h}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k} \cdot \frac{dz_h}{z_h}\Bigr) \\ &= \sum_{{}^{k}\deg(v_i) = {}^{k}\deg(v_j)} u_j \cdot \Bigl(\sum_{h \neq k} \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \cdot c_h \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c},k}^{*} A^{h}_{j\,i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k}\Bigr) \cdot \prod_{p=1}^{l} z_p^{\nu(c_p \cdot b_p(v_i)) - \nu(c_p \cdot b_p(v_j))} + u_i \cdot \sum_{h \neq k} \nu(c_h \cdot b_h(v_i)) \frac{dz_h}{z_h}. \end{aligned} \qquad (269)$$

Let ${}^{k}\mathcal{K}_u$ denote the vector subbundle of ${}^{\diamond}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k}$, generated by $\boldsymbol{u}_u := \bigl\{u_i \bigm| \deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}, \mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, u)\bigr\}$. Then we have the following decomposition ${}^{k}\mathcal{K}$ for $k = 1, \ldots, l$:

$${}^{\diamond}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k} = \bigoplus_u {}^{k}\mathcal{K}_u.$$

Lemma 13.2

- *The vector subbundle* ${}^{k}\mathcal{K}_u$ *is preserved by the residue* $\mathrm{Res}_k(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})$ *and the induced* λ*-connection* ${}^{k}\mathbb{D}$.

- *We have the following formula:*

$$\mathrm{Res}_k(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})_{|{}^k\mathcal{K}_u}(\boldsymbol{u}_u) = \boldsymbol{u}_u \cdot \Big(\nu\big(c_k \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u)\big) + \phi^*_{\boldsymbol{c},k}\mathcal{R}_u \cdot \prod_{p\neq k} z_p^{\nu(c_p\cdot b_p(v_i))-\nu(c_p\cdot b_p(v_j))}\Big).$$

  Here $\mathcal{R}_u$ denotes the representation matrix of $\mathrm{Res}_k(\mathbb{D})$ *on the vector subbundle* $\langle v_i \,|\, {}^k\deg^{(F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)})}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, u)\rangle \subset {}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0')}$ *with respect to the frame* $\boldsymbol{v}_u = \{v_i \,|\, {}^k\deg^{(F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)})}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0, u)\}$.

- *In particular, the eigenvalue of* $\mathrm{Res}_k(\widetilde{\mathbb{D}})_{|{}^k\mathcal{K}_u}$ *is* $\nu(c_k \cdot \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u)) + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$.

Proof The claims immediately follow from (268) and (269). ▮

Lemma 13.3 *The decompositions* ${}^k\mathcal{K}$ $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ *are compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.17.

Proof It immediately follows from our construction. ▮

Lemma 13.4 *We have the following decomposition on* $\mathcal{D}_k(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$*:*

$${}^kF_b^{(\lambda_0)\diamond}\phi^*_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{\kappa(c_k\cdot\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u))\leq b} {}^k\mathcal{K}_u. \tag{270}$$

Namely the decompositions $({}^k\mathcal{K} \,|\, k = 1, \ldots, l)$ *gives the splitting of the filtrations* $\big({}^kF^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, k = 1, \ldots l\big)$. ▮

Lemma 13.5 *When* c_k $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ *are sufficiently large,* $\phi^*\mathcal{E}$ *is CA in the sense of Definition* 13.1 *below.*

Proof It immediately follows from the second claim of Lemma 13.2. ▮

13.1.3 Convenient

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, and ϵ_0 be a sufficiently small positive number. Recall that we always have the following decomposition on $\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$:

$${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus \mathbb{E}\big({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)\big).$$

Definition 13.1 $\mathcal{E}$ *is called convenient at* λ_0*, if the following holds:*

(*A*) *The decomposition above is prolonged to the decomposition* ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_k(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus {}^k\mathcal{K}_u$*. Moreover the tuple of the decompositions* $\big({}^k\mathcal{K} \,\big|\, k = 1, \ldots, l\big)$ *is compatible.*

(*B*) *There exists a sequence of positive numbers* $\eta_1 > \eta_2 \cdots > \eta_l > 0$*:*

  - $\sum \eta_i < 1/2$
  - $\mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}, i)$ *is* η_i*-small.*
  - $\min\big\{|a - b| \,\big|\, a \neq b \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^0, i) \cup \{0\}\big\} > 2 \cdot \sum_{j>i} \eta_j$.

  $\mathcal{E}$ *is called CA (resp. CB) if the condition* (*A*) *(resp.* (*B*)*) holds.* ▮

Note that the decompositions ${}^k\mathcal{K}$ is uniquely determined if $\mathcal{E}$ is convenient at λ_0.

Lemma 13.6 *Assume that* $\mathcal{E}$ *is CA at* λ_0*. Then the induced connection* ${}^i\mathbb{D}$ *and the residue* $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ *preserve the decomposition* ${}^i\mathcal{K}$*.*

Proof Since the restrictions of ${}^i\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ to $\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ preserve ${}^i\mathcal{K}_{u\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$, they preserve ${}^i\mathcal{K}_u$ on $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. ▮

Lemma 13.7 *Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is CA at λ_0. We have the following decomposition:*

$$ {}^{i}F_{b}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\beta\bigr)=\bigoplus_{\substack{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u)=\beta\\ -1<\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\leq b}}{}^{i}\mathcal{K}_u. \tag{271}$$

Proof By definition, the restrictions of the both sides of (271) to $\mathcal{D}_i^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ are same. Then Lemma 13.7 immediately follows. ∎

Hence, if $\mathcal{E}$ is CA at λ_0, we obtain the naturally defined isomorphism:

$$ {}^{i}\mathcal{K}_u\simeq{}^{i}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)}\,{}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)},\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u)\bigr).$$

Thus the nilpotent parts $\mathcal{N}_i$ of the residues $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ are well defined as elements of $\mathrm{End}\bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)$ for any $i=1,\ldots,l$.

Lemma 13.8 *Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is CA at λ_0. Then the tuple $\bigl({}^{k}\mathcal{K}_u,\mathcal{N}_i\,\big|\,k\in\underline{l},i\in\underline{l}\bigr)$ is strongly sequentially compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.23. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with the decompositions $({}^{i}\mathcal{K}\,|\,i=1,\ldots,l)$. Let $\sum A^h\cdot z_h^{-1}dz_h$ denote the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$:

$$\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\Bigl(\sum_h A^h\cdot\frac{dz_h}{z_h}\Bigr).$$

Lemma 13.9 *Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is CA at λ_0. In the case ${}^{k}\deg^{\mathcal{K}}(v_i)\neq{}^{k}\deg^{\mathcal{K}}(v_j)$, we have $A^h_{i\,j\,|\,\mathcal{D}_k}=0$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 13.6. ∎

Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is CA at λ_0, and ${}^{k}\mathcal{K}$ $(k=1,\ldots,l)$ be the decompositions as in Definition 13.1. Then we put as follows, for any subset $I\subset\underline{l}$:

$$ {}^{I}\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{u}}:=\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}\mathcal{K}_{q_i(\boldsymbol{u})}.$$

Then we obtain the decomposition of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus{}^{I}\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

13.1.4 Functoriality for some pull back (I)

Let us return to the functoriality. Let η be a positive number such that $(1+\eta)^{l-1}\cdot 2/3<1$. We put $\tilde{X}:=\Delta(1+\eta)^{l-1}\times\Delta(2/3)\times\Delta^{n-l}$. Let us consider the morphism $\phi:\tilde{X}\longrightarrow X$ given as follows:

$$\phi^*(\zeta_i)=\begin{cases}\prod_{j=i}^{l}z_j & (i\leq l)\\[2ex] z_i & (i>l).\end{cases}$$

We put $\tilde{D}:=\phi^{-1}(D)$.

Lemma 13.10 *Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is convenient at λ_0. Then we have the natural isomorphism ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\phi^*\mathcal{E}\bigr)\simeq\phi^*\bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.*

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ which is compatible with the decompositions $\bigl({}^{i}\mathcal{K}\,\big|\,i\in\underline{l}\bigr)$. In this case, $u_i=\phi^*v_i$ holds (see the subsubsection 13.1.1*), and the degrees ${}^{h}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(u_i)$ are given as follows:*

$$ {}^{h}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(u_i)=\sum_{k\leq h}{}^{k}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i).$$

Proof If follows from the formula (265) for the degree of u_i. ∎

Let $\sum_k A^k \cdot d\zeta_k/\zeta_k$ be the λ-connection form of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e., $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot (\sum_k A^k \cdot d\zeta_k/\zeta_k)$ holds. Then we have the following:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{D}}\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \sum_h \Bigl(\sum_{k \leq h} \phi^* A^k\Bigr) \cdot \frac{dz_k}{z_k} =: \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \sum_h \tilde{A}^h \cdot \frac{dz_k}{z_k}.$$

Here we have the following:

$$\tilde{A}^h = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^h \phi^* A^k & (h \leq l) \\ \\ A^h & (h > l). \end{cases}$$

In particular, we obtain the following:

$$\tilde{A}^h_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \sum_{k \leq h} \phi_i^* A^k_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{i}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}.$$

Here ϕ_i denotes the morphism $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\underline{i}}$ is given as follows:

$$(\lambda, z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}, 0, z_{i+1}, \ldots, z_n) \longmapsto \bigl(\lambda, \textstyle\prod_{j=i+1}^l z_j,\, \ldots,\, z_{l-1} \cdot z_l,\, z_l,\, \ldots, z_n\bigr).$$

In particular, we have the following formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}_i(\tilde{\mathbb{D}}) = \sum_{k \leq i} \phi_i^* \,\mathrm{Res}_k(\mathbb{D})_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{i}}}.$$

We obtain the decomposition of the vector bundle ${}^\diamond\phi^*\mathcal{E}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus \phi^* {}^{\underline{i}}\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. We put as follows:

$${}^i\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_u = \bigoplus_{\phi_i^*(\boldsymbol{u})=u} \phi^* {}^{\underline{i}}\mathcal{K}_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Here we put $\phi_i^*(\boldsymbol{u}) := \sum_{j \leq i} q_j(\boldsymbol{u})$: Then we obtain the decomposition: ${}^\diamond\phi^*\mathcal{E}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus {}^{\underline{i}}\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_u$. Clearly the tuple of the decompositions $\bigl({}^i\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \bigm| i = 1, \ldots, l\bigr)$ is compatible.

Lemma 13.11 *The eigenvalue of* $\mathrm{Res}_i(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})$ *on* ${}^i\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_u$ *is* $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$. *In particular,* $\phi^*\mathcal{E}$ *is CA.*

Proof It immediately follows from our construction. ∎

The following lemma is also seen easily from our construction.

Lemma 13.12 *The nilpotent part* $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$ *of the residue* $\mathrm{Res}_i(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})$ *is given by* $\phi_i^*\mathcal{N}(\underline{i}) = \sum_{j \leq i} \phi_i^*\mathcal{N}_j$. ∎

13.1.5 Functoriality for some pull back (II)

We put $\tilde{X} = \Delta_z^{n-1}$. Let us consider the morphism $\phi : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X$, given as follows:

$$\phi^*(\zeta_i) = \begin{cases} z_1 & (i = 1, 2) \\ z_{i-1} & (i \geq 3). \end{cases}$$

Lemma 13.13 *Assume* $\mathcal{E}$ *is convenient at* λ_0. *Then we have the natural isomorphism* ${}^\diamond\phi^*\mathcal{E} \simeq \phi^{*\diamond}\mathcal{E}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ *be a frame of frame of* ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ *compatible with the decompositions* ${}^k\mathcal{K}$ $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$. *In this case, we have* $u_i = \phi^* v_i$ *(see the subsubsection* 13.1.1*), and the degrees* ${}^h\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(u_i)$ *are given as follows:*

$${}^h\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(u_i) = \begin{cases} {}^1\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) + {}^2\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i), & (h = 1), \\ \\ {}^{h+1}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i), & (h \geq 2). \end{cases}$$

Proof If follows from the formula (265) for the degree of u_i. ∎

Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is convenient at λ_0. Let $\sum_k \mathcal{A}^k d\zeta_k/\zeta_k$ denote the λ-connection of $\mathbb{D}$ with respect to the frame $\boldsymbol{v}$, i.e., $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot (\sum_k \mathcal{A}^k \cdot d\zeta_k/\zeta_k)$ holds. Then we have the following formula:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{D}}\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \Big((\phi^*\mathcal{A}^1 + \phi^*\mathcal{A}^2) \cdot \frac{dz_1}{z_1} + \sum_{h=1}^{n-1} \phi^*\mathcal{A}^{h+1} \cdot \frac{dz_h}{z_h} \Big).$$

Hence we have the following formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}_h(\tilde{\mathbb{D}}) = \begin{cases} \phi^* \mathrm{Res}_1(\mathbb{D})_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{2}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} + \phi^* \mathrm{Res}_2(\mathbb{D})_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{2}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} & (h=1) \\ \phi^* \mathrm{Res}_{h+1}(\mathbb{D}) & (h \geq 2). \end{cases}$$

Thus the nilpotent parts are as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i = \begin{cases} \phi^*(\mathcal{N}_1 + \mathcal{N}_2) & (i=1) \\ \phi^*\mathcal{N}_{i+1} & (i \geq 2). \end{cases}$$

Hence $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{i}) = \phi^*\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{i+1})$. Let $\tilde{W}(\underline{i})$ denote the weight filtration of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{i})$, and then we have $\tilde{W}(\underline{i}) = \phi^* W(\underline{i+1})$.

On the divisor $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we put as follows:

$${}^1\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_u = \bigoplus_{u_1+u_2=u} \phi^{*\,\underline{2}}\mathcal{K}_{(u_1,u_2)}.$$

On the divisors $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ $(i \geq 2)$, we put ${}^i\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_u = \phi^*({}^{i+1}\mathcal{K}_u)$. Then the decompositions ${}^i\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ satisfies the condition (A) in Definition 13.1. It is also easy to check the condition (B) in Definition 13.1. Hence we have the following lemma.

Lemma 13.14 *$\phi^*\mathcal{E}$ is convenient at λ_0.* ∎

13.2 Preliminary norm estimate

13.2.1 Statement

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ and ϵ_0 be a small positive number. Assume that $^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ is convenient at λ_0 and locally free over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of $^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ compatible with the tuple $\big({}^i\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m}) \,\big|\, i \in \underline{l},\, m \in \underline{l}\big)$.

Since $\boldsymbol{v}$ is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)$ for each v_i. We put as follows:

$$b_m(v_i) := \mathfrak{p}\big(\lambda, q_m(\boldsymbol{u}(v_i))\big) \quad h_m(v_i) := \frac{1}{2} \cdot \big(\deg^{W(\underline{m})}(v_i) - \deg^{W(\underline{m-1})}(v_i) \big).$$

We put as follows:

$$v_i' := v_i \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{l} |\zeta_m|^{b_m(v_i)} \cdot \big(-\log|\zeta_m|\big)^{-h_m(v_i)}.$$

Then we obtain the C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v_i')$ of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

We consider the following subsets Z and ∂Z:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &:= \big\{ (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n) \in X - D \,\big|\, |\zeta_{j-1}| \leq |\zeta_j| \leq 2^{-1},\ j \in \underline{l} \big\}, \\ \partial Z &:= \big\{ (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n) \in X - D \,\big|\, |\zeta_j| = 2^{-1},\ j \in \underline{l} \big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{272}$$

The purpose of this subsection is to show the following proposition.

Proposition 13.1 *On the region Z, the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted. Moreover there exists positive constants C_i $(i=1,2)$, depending on $H(h,\boldsymbol{v}')_{|\partial Z}$, such that $C_1 \leq H(h,\boldsymbol{v}') \leq C_2$ holds on the region Z.*

Let $\phi : \tilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ be a morphism given in the subsubsection 13.1.4. We obtain the holomorphic frame $\boldsymbol{u} = \phi^{*}\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{\diamond}\phi^{*}\mathcal{E}$. We also obtain the C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{u}' = (u_i') = \phi^{*}\boldsymbol{v}'$ over $\tilde{X} - \tilde{D}$. It is easy to see the following:

$$u_i' = u_i \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{l} |z_m|^{b_m(u_i)} \cdot \Bigl(-\sum_{t\geq m} \log|z_t|\Bigr)^{-h_m(u_i)} = u_i \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{l} |z_m|^{\sum_{j\leq m} b_j(v_i)} \cdot \Bigl(-\sum_{t\geq m} \log|z_t|\Bigr)^{-h_m(v_i)}.$$

Here we have $b_m(u_i) = \sum_{j\leq m} b_j(v_i)$ and $h_m(u_i) = h_m(v_i)$.

Let us consider the following subsets $\tilde{Z}$ and $\partial\tilde{Z}$:

$$\tilde{Z} := \bigl\{(z_1,\ldots,z_n) \in \tilde{X} - \tilde{D} \bigm| |z_i| \leq 1, (i \leq l-1),\ |z_l| \leq 2^{-1}\bigr\},$$

$$\partial\tilde{Z} := \bigl\{(z_1,\ldots,z_n) \in \tilde{X} - \tilde{D} \bigm| |z_i| = 1,\ (i \leq l-1),\ |z_l| = 2^{-1}\bigr\}.$$

Note the $\phi(\tilde{Z}) = Z$ and $\phi(\partial\tilde{Z}) = \partial Z$.

It is easy to see that Proposition 13.1 is equivalent to Proposition 13.2.

Proposition 13.2 *The C^{∞}-frame $\boldsymbol{u}'$ is adapted on $\tilde{X} - \tilde{D}$. Moreover there exist positive constant C_i $(i=1,2)$, depending only on $H(h,\boldsymbol{u}')_{|\partial\tilde{Z}}$, such that $C_1 \leq H(h,\boldsymbol{u}') \leq C_2$ over $\tilde{Z}$.*

We will show Proposition 13.2, or equivalently Proposition 13.1 in the following subsubsections. We use an induction on the dimension of X. We assume that the propositions hold in the case $\dim X \leq n-1$, and we will prove the propositions hold in the case $\dim X = n$. The hypothesis of the induction will be used in Lemma 13.19.

13.2.2 Step 1. Independence of a choice of compatible frames

Lemma 13.15 *Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is compatible with the tuple $\bigl({}^{k}\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m}) \bigm| k \in \underline{l},\ m \in \underline{l}\bigr)$.*

Assume that the claim in Proposition 13.1 *holds for $\boldsymbol{v}$. Then the same claim holds for any other frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is compatible with the tuple $\bigl({}^{k}\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m}) \bigm| k \in \underline{l},\ m \in \underline{l}\bigr)$.*

Proof Let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}$ be other frame of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, which is compatible with the tuple $\bigl({}^{k}\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m}) \bigm| k \in \underline{l},\ m \in \underline{l}\bigr)$. We have the relation of the form:

$$v_i^{(1)} = \sum B_{j\,i} \cdot v_j.$$

Here $B_{j\,i}$ are holomorphic on X and $B_{j\,i\,|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{k}}} = 0$ unless the following holds:

$$ {}^{\underline{k}}\deg^{\mathcal{K}}(v_i^{(1)}) = {}^{\underline{k}}\deg^{\mathcal{K}}(v_j^{(1)}), \qquad \deg^{W(\underline{m})}(v_i^{(1)}) \leq \deg^{W(\underline{m})}(v_j^{(1)}) \quad (\forall m \leq k) \tag{273}$$

We have the induced relation $u_i^{(1)} = \sum \phi^{*}B_{j\,i} \cdot u_j = \sum \tilde{B}_{j\,i} \cdot u_j$. Then we have $\tilde{B}_{j\,i\,|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k} = 0$ unless (273) holds for i and j. We also have the induced relation $u_i^{(1)\,\prime} = \sum \tilde{B}'_{j\,i} \cdot u_j'$, and then we have the following:

$$\tilde{B}'_{j\,i} = \tilde{B}_{j\,i} \cdot \prod_{p} |z_p|^{b_p(u_i^{(1)}) - b_p(u_j)} \cdot \prod_{p} \Bigl(-\sum_{t\geq p} \log|z_t|\Bigr)^{-h_p(u_i^{(1)}) + h_p(u_j)}.$$

Once we obtain the boundedness of $\tilde{B}'$, then we obtain the boundedness of $\tilde{B}'^{\,-1}$ by symmetry. It implies the equivalence of the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{u}^{(1)\,\prime}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}'$. So we have only to prove the boundedness of $\tilde{B}'$.

(i) Note that we have $\tilde{B}_{j\,i\,|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p} = 0$ in the case $b_p(u_i^{(1)}) - b_p(u_j) < 0$. We also have $-1 < b_p(u_i^{(1)}) - b_p(u_j)$, due to convenience of $\mathcal{E}$ at λ_0. Thus $\tilde{B}'_{j\,i\,|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p} = 0$.

(ii) We have the following equality:

$$\prod_p \Bigl(-\sum_{t\geq p} \log|z_t|\Bigr)^{-h_p(u_i^{(1)})+h_p(u_j)} = \prod_p \Bigl(\frac{-\sum_{t\geq p}\log|z_t|}{-\sum_{t\geq p+1}\log|z_t|}\Bigr)^{a_p}.$$

Here we put as follows:

$$a_p = -\frac{1}{2}\Bigl(\deg^{W(\underline{p})}(u_i^{(1)}) - \deg^{W(\underline{p})}(u_j)\Bigr).$$

In the case $a_p \leq 0$, it is easy to see that $(-\sum_{t\geq p}\log|z_t|)^{a_p} \cdot (-\sum_{t\geq p+1}\log|z_t|)^{-a_p}$ is bounded. In the case $a_p > 0$, we have $\tilde{B}_{j\,i\,|\,\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p} = 0$, and we have the following inequality on $\tilde{Z}$, for some positive constant C:

$$\left(\frac{-\sum_{t\geq p+1}\log|z_t| - \log|z_p|}{-\sum_{t\geq p+1}\log|z_t|}\right)^{a_p} \leq \left(1 + \frac{-\log|z_p|}{C}\right)^{a_p}$$

Here we have used $-\sum_{t\geq p+1}\log|z_t| \geq -\log|z_l| \geq C$ for some positive constant C.

From (i) and (ii), the boundedness of $\tilde{B}'_{i\,j}$ follows immediately. ▮

13.2.3 Step 2. Strongly compatible frame $\boldsymbol{v}$

Thus we pick a frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ which is strongly compatible with $\bigl({}^k\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m})\,\big|\, k\in \underline{l},\ m\in\underline{l}\bigr)$ in the sense of Corollary 4.7. Namely we take a frame compatible frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ as the following condition is satisfied:

Condition 13.1 *A compatible frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ consists of sections $v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$. The following holds:*

$$N(\underline{1})v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} = \begin{cases} v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i} & (-h+2\leq q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\leq h,\ h-q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) \text{ is even}) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

We have ${}^j\deg^{\mathcal{K}}(v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}) = q_j(\boldsymbol{u})$ and $\deg^{W(\underline{m})}(v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}) = q_m(\boldsymbol{h})$. ▮

Then we obtain the frame $\boldsymbol{u} = \bigl(u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}\bigr)$ of ${}^\diamond\phi^*\mathcal{E}$.

Let q_1 denote the projection of $\tilde{X}$ onto the first component $\Delta(1+\eta)$. We have the naturally defined projection $\Omega^{1,0}_{\tilde{X}} \longrightarrow q_1^*\Omega^{1,0}_{\Delta(1+\eta)}$.

Let $\mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})$ denote the composite of the following:

$$\phi^*\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathbb{D}}} \phi^*\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_{\tilde{X}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}\otimes q_1^*\Omega^{1,0}_{\Delta(1+\eta)}.$$

Lemma 13.16 *In general, let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}$ be a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$, which is not necessarily compatible. For the frame $\boldsymbol{u}^{(1)} = \phi^*\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}$ of ${}^\diamond\phi^*\mathcal{E}$, we have the following implication:*

$$\mathbb{D}v_i^{(1)} = \sum u_j^{(1)}\cdot \mathcal{A}^k_{j\,i}\frac{d\zeta_k}{\zeta_k} \Longrightarrow \mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})u_i^{(1)} = \sum u_j^{(1)}\cdot\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^1_{j\,i}\cdot\frac{dz_1}{z_1} = \sum u_j^{(1)}\cdot\phi^*\mathcal{A}^1_{j\,i}\cdot\frac{dz_1}{z_1}.$$

Proof It can be shown by a direct calculation. ▮

In particular, if $\boldsymbol{v}$ is as in Condition 13.1. we have the following on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ $(2\leq k\leq l)$. (Here we use the notation $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k$ instead of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ for simplicity of the notation.):

$$\mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i\,|\,\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k} = \begin{cases} \Bigl(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} + u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i}\Bigr)\cdot\left(\dfrac{dz_1}{z_1}\right)_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k}, & (-h+2\leq \mathfrak{q}_1(\boldsymbol{h})\leq h,\ h-q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) \text{ even }), \\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}\left(\dfrac{dz_1}{z_1}\right)_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k} & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h}) = -h) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \tag{274}$$

On the divisor $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$, we have the following formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}(\mathfrak{q}_1\tilde{\mathbb{D}})u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i\,|\,\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}=\begin{cases}\Bigl(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}+u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i}\Bigr)_{|\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}, & (-h+2\leq\mathfrak{q}_1(\boldsymbol{h})\leq h,\ h-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\text{ even }),\\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i\,|\,\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1} & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=-h)\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}\tag{275}$$

13.2.4 Model bundle and the comparing morphism

For $h=q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\geq 0$, $\boldsymbol{u}$ and i, we take the vector subspace of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|(\lambda,O)}$ as follows:

$$V_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}:=\bigoplus_{a=0}^{h}\boldsymbol{C}\cdot v_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2a\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i}\subset{}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|(\lambda_0,O)}.$$

Then we have the decomposition: ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_{|(\lambda_0,O)}=\bigoplus V_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$. The decomposition is compatible with $\mathrm{Res}_1(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{N}_1$. Let $\mathcal{N}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{N}_1$ to $V_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$.

Then we pick the model bundle $E(V_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i},\mathcal{N}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i})\otimes L(u_1)$ over Δ^*. We obtain the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{E}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$ over $\Delta^*\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. The direct sum of $\mathcal{E}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_0$. We have the natural metric h_0 on $\mathcal{E}_0$, which is a direct sum of the metrics $h_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$.

On $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times\Delta$, we have the prolongation ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}_0$ and the canonical frame $\boldsymbol{u}^0=(u^0_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},h,i})$. Then we have the following:

$$\mathbb{D}_0u^0_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}:=\begin{cases}\bigl(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}+u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i}\bigr)\cdot\dfrac{dz_1}{z_1} & (-h+2\leq q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\leq h,\ h-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\text{ even })\\ \bigl(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}\bigr)\cdot\dfrac{dz_1}{z_1}, & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=-h),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}\tag{276}$$

We also have the following formula:

$$\mathrm{Res}(\mathbb{D}_0)u^0_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}:=\begin{cases}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}+u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h}-2\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,i} & (-h+2\leq q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\leq h,\ h-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})\text{ even })\\ \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\cdot u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} & (q_1(\boldsymbol{h})=-h),\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}\tag{277}$$

We have the holomorphic vector bundle $\phi^*q_1^{*\diamond}\mathcal{E}_0$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times\tilde{X}$. We have the λ-connection $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_0:=\phi^*q_1^*\mathbb{D}_0$. The frames $\phi^*q_1^*\boldsymbol{u}^0$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ give the isomorphism $\Phi:\phi^*q_1^{*\diamond}\mathcal{E}_0\longrightarrow{}^\diamond\mathcal{E}$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 13.17 *We have the following equality on the divisor* $\bigcup_{k=2}^{l}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k$*:*

$$\Phi\circ\mathfrak{q}_1\bigl(\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_0\bigr)-\mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})\circ\Phi=0$$

We have the following equality on the divisor $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1$*:*

$$\Phi\circ\mathrm{Res}\bigl(\mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_0)\bigr)-\mathrm{Res}\bigl(\mathfrak{q}_1(\tilde{\mathbb{D}})\bigr)\circ\Phi=0.$$

Proof It immediately follows from (274), (275), (276) and (277). ∎

13.2.5 Step 3. The metric on $\phi^* q_1^* \mathcal{E}_0$

We have the metric $\phi^* q_1^* h_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$ on $\phi^* q_1^* \mathcal{E}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$. We put as follows:

$$\tilde{h}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} := \phi^* q_1^* \bigl(h_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}\bigr) \cdot \prod_{k=2}^{l} |z_k|^{-\sum_{2\leq t\leq k} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_t)} \times \prod_{k=2}^{l} \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq k} \log|z_m|^2\Bigr)^{q_k(\boldsymbol{h})}.$$

The metrics $\tilde{h}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i}$ induce the metric $\tilde{h}_0$ on $\phi^* q_1^* \mathcal{E}_0$.

We put as follows:

$$\tilde{u}^{0\,\prime}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} := \tilde{u}^{0}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l} |z_k|^{\sum_{1\leq t\leq k} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_t)} \times \prod_{k=1}^{l} \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq k} \log|z_t|^2\Bigr)^{-q_k(\boldsymbol{h})}.$$

Lemma 13.18 *Then the C^∞-frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}^{0\,\prime}$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0) - \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is adapted with respect to the metric $\tilde{h}_0$.*

Proof We put as follows:

$$u^{0\,\prime}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} := u^{0}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} \cdot |z|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_1)} \cdot (-\log|z_1|)^{-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})}.$$

Then the C^∞-metric $\boldsymbol{u}^{0\,\prime} = (u^{0\,\prime}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i})$ over Δ^* is adapted with respect to h_0. Then the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{u}^{0\,\prime}$ immediately follows. ▮

We put as follows:

$$^{\heartsuit}\tilde{u}^{0\,\prime}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} := \tilde{u}^{0}_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} \times \prod_{k=2}^{l} |z_k|^{\sum_{1\leq t\leq k} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_t)} \times \prod_{k=3}^{l} \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq k} \log|z_m|^2\Bigr)^{-q_k(\boldsymbol{h})} \times \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq 2} \log|z_m|^2\Bigr)^{-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})-q_2(\boldsymbol{h})}.$$

We obtain the frame C^∞-frame $^{\heartsuit}\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}^{0\,\prime}$ of $\mathcal{E}_0$ over $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0) - \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. We put as follows:

$$Y := \bigl\{(z_1,\ldots,z_n) \in \tilde{Z} \bigm| |z_1| = 1\bigr\}. \tag{278}$$

Corollary 13.1 *The restriction $^{\heartsuit}\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}^{0\,\prime}_{|Y}$ is adapted with respect to the metric $\tilde{h}_{0|Y}$.* ▮

13.2.6 Step 4. The end of the proof

We put as follows:

$$^{\heartsuit}u'_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} := u_{h,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{h},i} \cdot \prod_{k=2}^{l} |z_k|^{\sum_{1\leq t\leq k} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u_t)} \times \prod_{k=3}^{l} \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq k} \log|z_m|^2\Bigr)^{-q_k(\boldsymbol{h})} \times \Bigl(-\sum_{m\geq 2} \log|z_m|^2\Bigr)^{-q_1(\boldsymbol{h})-q_2(\boldsymbol{h})}.$$

Lemma 13.19 *On the set Y given in* (278), *the C^∞-frame $^{\heartsuit}\boldsymbol{u}'$ is adapted with respect to the metric $\phi^* h$.*

Proof We put $\tilde{X}_a := \{(a,z_2,\ldots,z_n) \in \tilde{X}\}$ and $X_a := \{(\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_n) \in X \,|\, \zeta_1 = a\zeta_2\}$. Due to the result in the subsubsection 13.1.5, the restriction $\mathcal{E}_{|X_a}$ is convenient at λ_0, and the frame $\boldsymbol{v}_{|X_a}$ is compatible. Hence we obtain the result due to the assumption of the induction. ▮

Corollary 13.2 *The restriction $\Phi_{|Y}$ is bounded over the set Y.*

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 13.1 and Lemma 13.19. ▮

Then, by using the method explained in the subsection 6.1 of our previous paper, we obtain the boundedness of Φ on the region $\tilde{Z}$. Thus the induction can proceed, and therefore we obtain Proposition 13.1 and Proposition 13.2. ▮

13.3 Norm estimate for holomorphic sections

We put $X := \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let us pick any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}$. We pick $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}) \notin \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Let pick a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0 such that ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ is locally free over the closure of $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a frame of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$, $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and W (Corollary4.4). For each v_i, we have the element $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i) \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l})$ such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = \mathfrak{k}\big(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\big)$. We put as follows, for each v_i:

$$b_j(v_i) = \mathfrak{p}\big(\lambda, q_j(\boldsymbol{u}(v_i))\big), \quad h_j(v_i) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\deg^{W(\underline{j})}(v_i) - \deg^{W(\underline{j-1})}(v_i)\big).$$

Then we put as follows:

$$v_i' := v_i \cdot \prod_j \Big(|z_j|^{b_j(v_i)} \cdot (-\log|z_j|)^{-h_j(v_i)} \Big).$$

Then we obtain the C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v_i')$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

For any positive number C, we put as follows:

$$Z(C) := \big\{ (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in X - D \,\big|\, |z_{i-1}|^C \leq |z_i|, \ (i \in \underline{l}) \big\}.$$

Theorem 13.1 *Let C be any positive number. Then the C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted over the region $Z(C) \times \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.*

Proof First we give some easy reductions.

Lemma 13.20 *For the proof of Theorem* 13.1 *We may assume $\boldsymbol{b} = 0$.*

Proof We take the model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{b})$ over $X - D$, and prolongment ${}_{-\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})$ of the deformed holomorphic bundle over $\mathcal{X}$. We have the canonical frame e of ${}_{-\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})$ such that $|e|_h = \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{q_j(\boldsymbol{b})}$.

We have the naturally defined isomorphism ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E} \otimes {}_{-\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}) \simeq {}^{\diamond}\big(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})\big)$. Once we show the claim of Theorem 13.1 for ${}^{\diamond}\big(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})\big)$, then we obtain the claim for ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, too. ▮

Lemma 13.21 *Assume that we have already shown the following claim:*

> *(P): The C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted over $Z(C) \times \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')$ for some positive number ϵ_0'. (The number ϵ_0' can be smaller than ϵ_0).*

Then Theorem 13.1 *is obtained.*

Proof Let λ_1 be any point of the closure $\overline{\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)}$ of $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Due to the assumption of Lemma 13.21, we may assume that we have some positive number ϵ_1' such that $\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted over $Z(C) \times \Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$. We may assume that we can take a finite subset $S \subset \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ such that $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \subset \bigcup_{\lambda_1 \in S} \Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$. Then the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ over $\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$ for $\lambda_1 \in S$ implies the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. ▮

Let us return to the proof of Theorem 13.1. Note we may freely replace a positive number ϵ_0 with a smaller one, due to Lemma 13.21. Let η_1 be a positive number such that $\eta_1 \cdot \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{E} < 1/3$.

Lemma 13.22 *We can pick elements $(a_i, c_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \{r \,|\, -1 < r < 0\}$ and numbers η_i $(i \in \underline{l})$ as follows, inductively:*

- *First we take (a_1, c_1) satisfying the following:*
    - *We put $S_1 := \big\{ a_1 + \kappa(c_1 \cdot b) \,\big|\, b \in \mathcal{P}ar\big({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, 1\big) \big\}$. Then S_1 is η_1-small, and we have $0 \notin S_1$.*

  Then we put as follows:

$$\eta_2 := \frac{1}{3} \min\big\{ |a - b| \,\big|\, a, b \in S_1, \ a \neq b \big\}.$$

- *Suppose that we have already pick (a_j, c_j) $(j < i)$ and η_j $(j \leq i)$. Then we take (a_i, c_i) as follows:*

– *The inequality* $c_i > C \cdot c_{i-1}$ *holds.*

– *We put* $S_i := \bigl\{a_i + \kappa(c_i \cdot b) \,\big|\, b \in \mathcal{P}ar({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)\bigr\}$*. Then the set* S_i *is* η_i*-small and we have* $0 \notin S_i$*.*

Then we put as follows:

$$\eta_{i+1} := \frac{1}{3}\min\bigl\{|a-b| \,\big|\, a,b \in S_i,\ a \neq b\bigr\}.$$

Moreover, we may assume that c_i *is sufficiently large with respect to* $\mathcal{KMS}({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ *for each* i*, in the sense of Definition* 2.1. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_l)$ be such an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$ as in Lemma 13.22. We can take a small positive number ϵ_0' such that ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E} \otimes L(\boldsymbol{a})\bigr)$ is locally free on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0') \times X$. Due to our choice of $(c_1, \ldots, c_l)$, ${}^{\diamond}\bigl(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E} \otimes L(\boldsymbol{a})\bigr)$ is convenient. (See Lemma 13.5 and Definition 13.1).

Let e be the canonical base of the deformed holomorphic bundle $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{a})$ of the model bundle $L(\boldsymbol{a})$. We have $|e| = \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{a_j}$. We put $e' := e \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{-a_j}$, and then we have $|e'| = 1$. On the other hand, we have the frame $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_i)$ of ${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')$ as in the subsubsection 13.1.2:

$$u_i := \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^* v_i \cdot \prod_j z_j^{\nu(c_j \cdot b_j(v_i))}.$$

Then the tensor product $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes e = (u_i \otimes e)$ is a frame of the vector bundle ${}^{\diamond}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E} \otimes L(\boldsymbol{a})$, which is compatible with $\bigl({}^{k}\mathcal{K}, W(\underline{m}) \,\big|\, k \in \underline{l},\ m \in \underline{l}\bigr)$.

We take the C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{u}' = (u_i')$ of $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0') - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0')$:

$$u_i' := u_i \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} |z_j|^{\kappa(c_j \cdot b_j(v_i))}.$$

Due to Proposition 13.1, we obtain the adaptedness of the C^∞-frame $\boldsymbol{u}' \otimes e' = (u_i' \otimes e')$ on the region Z, given in (272). It is easy to see that we have the relation $u_i' = v_i' \cdot \omega_i$ for some C^∞-function ω_i on Z such that $|\omega_i| = 1$. Thus the frame $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^*\boldsymbol{v}'$ is adapted on the region Z. It implies the adaptedness of the frame $\boldsymbol{v}'$ on the following region:

$$Z(c_1, \ldots, c_l) := \bigl\{(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in X - D \,\big|\, |z_{i-1}|^{c_{i-1}} < |z_i|^{c_i},\ i \in \underline{l}\bigr\}.$$

Since we have $C \cdot c_i < c_{i+1}$ due to our choice of $c_1, \ldots, c_l$, we have the implication $Z(C) \subset Z(c_1, \ldots, c_l)$. Thus we are done. ∎

13.4 Norm estimate for flat sections

13.4.1 Preliminary

Let $\mathbb{H}$ denote the upper half plane. We use the complex coordinate $(\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n)$ of $\mathbb{H}^n$. We also use the real coordinate $\zeta_i = x_i + \sqrt{-1}y_i$.

Lemma 13.23 *Let* (a_k, n_k) $(k = 1, \ldots, l)$ *be elements of* $\boldsymbol{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$*. We have the following equality:*

$$\prod_{k=1}^{l} y_k^{-a_k + a_{k-1} + n_k} = \prod_{k=1}^{l-1} \left(\frac{y_k}{y_{k+1}}\right)^{-a_k + \sum_{i \leq k} n_i} \times y^{-a_l + \sum_{i \leq l} n_i}. \tag{279}$$

Proof We use an induction on l. We assume that the following equality holds:

$$\prod_{k=1}^{l-1} y_k^{-a_k + a_{k-1} + n_k} = \prod_{k=1}^{l-2} \left(\frac{y_k}{y_{k+1}}\right)^{-a_k + \sum_{i \leq k} n_i} \times y^{-a_{l-1} + \sum_{i \leq l-1} n_i}. \tag{280}$$

By a direct calculation, we have the following:

$$y_{l-1}^{-a_{l-1} + \sum_{i \leq l-1} n_i} \times y_l^{-a_l + a_{l-1} + n_l} = \left(\frac{y_{l-1}}{y_l}\right)^{-a_{l-1} + \sum_{i \leq l-1} n_i} \times y_l^{-a_l + \sum_{i \leq l} n_i}. \tag{281}$$

From the equalities (280) and (281), we obtain the equality (279). Thus the induction can proceed. ▮

Let C_i $(i=1,2,3)$ be positive numbers. We put as follows:

$$\tilde{Z}(C_1,C_2,C_3) := \Big\{ (\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_l)\in\mathbb{H}^l \,\Big|\, |x_i|\leq C_1,\ y_{i+1}\leq C_2\cdot y_i,\ (i\in\underline{l}),\ y_n\geq C_3 \Big\}.$$

Let (a_k,n_k) $(k=1,\ldots,l)$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\mathbb{Z}$. Let us consider the following function:

$$F_l := \prod_{k=1}^{l} y_k^{-a_k+a_{k-1}}\cdot\big|x_k+\sqrt{-1}y_k\big|^{n_k}.$$

Lemma 13.24 *Let C_b $(b=1,2,3)$ be any positive numbers. Assume $a_k\geq\sum_{i\leq k}n_i$. The function F_l is bounded on the region $\tilde{Z}(C_1,C_2,C_3)$.*

Proof We have only to show the boundedness of $\prod_{k=1}^{l} y_k^{-a_k+a_{k-1}+n_k}$ over $\tilde{Z}(C_1,C_2,C_3)$. Then Lemma 13.24 follows from Lemma 13.23. ▮

13.4.2 Norm estimate in the case where λ is fixed

Let us consider the norm estimate for flat sections. For simplicity, we consider the case $X=\Delta^n$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$, where we put $D_i:=\{z_i=0\}$. Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X-D$. We have the universal covering $\pi:\mathbb{H}^n\longrightarrow X-D$, given by $\zeta_i\longmapsto\exp\big(\sqrt{-1}\zeta_i\big)$. Let λ be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$. Let us consider the norm estimate of flat sections of $\pi^{-1}\mathcal{E}^\lambda$.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}=(s_i)$ be a frame of $H(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)$, which is compatible with $\big({}^i\mathbb{E},{}^j\mathcal{F},W(\underline{m})\,\big|\,i\in\underline{n},\ j\in\underline{n},\ m\in\underline{n}\big)$. We have the elements $\boldsymbol{u}(s_i)\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$, such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E},\mathcal{F}}(s_i)=\mathfrak{k}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}(s_i))$. Let M_k^u denote the unipotent part of the monodromy of $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$, and we put as follows:

$$N_k := \frac{-1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\log M_k^u.$$

For any $\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l$, we put as follows:

$$N^{\boldsymbol{n}} := \prod_{k=1}^{l} N_k^{n_k}.$$

The matrix $b(\boldsymbol{n}):=\big(b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}\big)$ is determined by the relation $N^{\boldsymbol{n}}\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{s}\cdot b(\boldsymbol{n})$, i.e., $N^{\boldsymbol{n}}s_i=\sum b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}s_j$.

Lemma 13.25 *Assume that $b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}\neq 0$. Then we have the following:*

- $\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(s_i)=\deg^{\mathbb{E}}(s_j)$.
- ${}^k\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i)\geq{}^k\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_j)$ *for any $k=1,\ldots,n$.*
- *Let l be any integer such that $1\leq l\leq n$. In the case ${}^k\deg^{\mathbb{E},\mathcal{F}}(s_i)={}^k\deg^{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{F}}(s_j)$ for $k\leq l$, we also have the following, for any $k\leq l$:*
$$\deg^{W(\underline{k})}(s_i)\geq\deg^{W(\underline{k})}(s_j)+2\sum_{t\leq k}n_t.$$

Proof It immediately follows from our choice of $\boldsymbol{s}$. ▮

We put $v_i:=F\big(s_i,\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}(s_i))\big)$. Then $\boldsymbol{v}=(v_i)$ is a frame of ${}^\diamond\mathcal{E}^\lambda$ which is compatible with $\big({}^i\mathbb{E},{}^jF,W(\underline{m})\,\big|\,i\in\underline{n},\ j\in\underline{n},\ m\in\underline{n}\big)$. We have the elements $\boldsymbol{u}(v_i)\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$ such that $\deg^{\mathbb{E},F}(v_i)=\mathfrak{k}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}(v_i))$.

We put $\alpha_k(s_j):=\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_k(v_j))$. Let $\boldsymbol{n}!$ denote the number $\prod_{i=1}^n n_i!$ for $\boldsymbol{n}=(n_1,\ldots,n_n)$. Then we have the following:

$$v_i=\prod_{k=1}^{n} z_k^{\alpha_k(s_i)}\cdot\sum_{j}\frac{b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}}{\boldsymbol{n}!}\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{n}\big(\log z_k\big)^{n_k}\cdot s_j. \tag{282}$$

Note we also have the following relation:

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_k(v_j)) = \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j)) - \mathrm{Re}\big(\alpha_k(s_j)\big).$$

We put $h_k(v_j) := 2^{-1}\big(\deg^{W(\underline{k})}(v_j) - \deg^{W(\underline{k-1})}(v_j)\big)$ and $h_k(s_j) := 2^{-1}\big(\deg^{W(\underline{k})}(s_j) - \deg^{W(\underline{k-1})}(s_j)\big)$. Note we have $h_k(s_j) = h_k(v_j)$.

We put as follows:

$$v'_j := v_j \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l} |z_k|^{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_k(v_j))} \cdot \big(-\log|z_k|\big)^{-h_k(v_j)},$$

$$s'_j := s_j \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l} |z_k|^{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j))} \cdot \big(-\log|z_k|\big)^{-h_k(s_j)}.$$

Then we obtain the frames $\boldsymbol{v}' = (v'_i)$ and $\boldsymbol{s}' = (s'_i)$.

We put as follows:

$$B_{j\,i} := \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}} \frac{b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}}{\boldsymbol{n}!} \prod_k z_k^{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_i)) - \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j))} \times \big(-\log|z_k|\big)^{-h_k(s_i)+h_k(s_j)} \times \big(-\log z_k\big)^{n_k}.$$

Thus we obtain the matrix valued function B.

Lemma 13.26 *We have the relation* $\boldsymbol{v}' = \boldsymbol{s}' \cdot B$.

Proof We have the following:

$$v'_i = \sum_{j,\boldsymbol{n}} \frac{b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i}}{\boldsymbol{n}!} \prod_k z_k^{\alpha_k(s_i) + \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_k(v_i)) - \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j))} \big(-\log|z_k|\big)^{-h_k(v_i)+h_k(s_j)} \times (\log z)^{n_k} \cdot s'_j.$$

We have $\alpha_k(s_i) + \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u_k(v_i)) = \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_i))$ and $h_k(v_i) = h_k(s_i)$. Thus we obtain the result. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 13.27

- *We have* $B_{i\,i} = 1$.
- *Assume* $B_{j\,i} \neq 0$, *then we have* ${}^k\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i) \geq {}^k\deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_j)$.

Namely the matrix B is triangular, and the diagonal components are 1.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 13.25. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 13.28 *The matrix valued functions B and B^{-1} are bounded over* $\tilde{Z}(C_1, C_2, C_3)$.

Proof Assume $b(\boldsymbol{n})_{j\,i} \neq 0$. Then we have $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_i)) - \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j)) \geq 0$ for any k. Moreover let h be the number such that $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_i)) - \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_k(s_j)) = 0$ for any $k < h$ and that $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_h(s_i)) - \mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda, u_h(s_j)) \neq 0$.

Lemma 13.29 *Let h be as above. On the region $\tilde{Z}(C_1, C_2, C_3)$, we have the boundedness of the following:*

$$\prod_{k \geq h} z_k^{\mathfrak{p}^f\left(\lambda, u_k(s_i) - u_k(s_j)\right)} \times \big(-\log|z_k|\big)^{-h_k(s_i)+h_k(s_j)} \times (\log z_k)^{n_k}.$$

Proof We have only to compare the order of $|z_h|^{\mathfrak{p}^f\left(\lambda, u_h(s_i) - u_h(s_j)\right)}$ and $\prod_{k \geq h}(-\log|z_k|)^M$. Note there exists a positive constant we have $|z_h|^C \leq |z_k|$ for any $k \geq h$ over $Z(C_1, C_2, C_3)$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 13.30 *Let h be as above. We have the boundedness of the following function over* $\tilde{Z}(C_1, C_2, C_3)$:

$$\prod_{k=1}^{h-1} (-\log|z_k|)^{-h_k(s_i)+h_k(s_j)} \times (\log z_k)^{n_k}.$$

Proof We put $a_k := 2^{-1}\bigl(\deg^{W(\underline{k})}(s_i) - \deg^{W(\underline{k})}(s_j)\bigr)$. Then we have $-h_k(s_i) + h_k(s_j) = -a_k + a_{k-1}$ and $-a_k + \sum_{i \leq k} n_i \leq 0$ for any $k \leq h$. Then we obtain the desired boundedness from Lemma 13.24. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Lemma 13.28. The boundedness of B immediately follows from Lemma 13.29 and Lemma 13.30. Since B is triangular such that the diagonal components are 1, the boundedness of B^{-1} follows from the boundedness of B. ∎

Theorem 13.2 *The frame $\boldsymbol{s}'$ is adapted on the region $\tilde{Z}(C_1, C_2, C_3)$.*

Proof It follows from the adaptedness of $\boldsymbol{v}'$ and the boundedness of B and B^{-1} on the region $\tilde{Z}(C_1, C_2, C_3)$. ∎

Part IV

An application to the theory of pure twistor D-modules

14 Nearby cycle functor for $\mathcal{R}$-module

14.1 The KMS structure of $\mathcal{R}$-module

We recall the nearby cycle functor for $\mathcal{R}$-modules introduced by Sabbah, with some minor generalization. We recommend the reader to read the readable paper [42]. In particular, see the chapters 0 and 1 for the basic of $\mathcal{R}$-modules, and see the chapter 3 in [42] for V-filtration and the nearby cycle functor. For most of the definitions and the lemmas contained in this section, the reader can find the counterpart in [42]. We also use some results in [42] without mention.

We consider the right $\mathcal{R}$-modules in this subsection.

Remark 14.1 *Sabbah kindly informed the author on the revision of his paper* [43]*, in which the generalization is discussed. We keep this section for our reference in the later discussion.* ∎

14.1.1 V-filtration

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an $\mathcal{R}_{X \times \boldsymbol{C}}$-module. Let t be the coordinate of $\boldsymbol{C}$.

Definition 14.1 *A V-filtration at λ_0 is defined to be a filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$, defined on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the following:*

$$U^{(\lambda_0)}_a(\mathcal{M}) \cdot V_m(\mathcal{R}) \subset U^{(\lambda_0)}_{a+m}(\mathcal{M}).$$

(See the section 3.1.a. *in* [42] *for $V_m(\mathcal{R})$.) A V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ at λ_0 is called monodromic, if there exists a monic $b(s) \in \boldsymbol{C}[\lambda][s]$ such that*

- *$b\bigl(t\partial_t - k \cdot \lambda\bigr)$ acts trivially on $U^{(\lambda_0)}_k(\mathcal{M}) / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k-1}(\mathcal{M})$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.*
- g.c.d.$\Bigl(b\bigl(s - k\lambda\bigr),\ b\bigl(s - l\lambda\bigr)\Bigr) \in \boldsymbol{C}[\lambda] - \{0\}$ *if $k \neq l$.* ∎

Later we will consider a refinement of V-filtration, which is the filtration indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}$. It will be also called by V-filtration. Recall the definition of good V-filtration.

Definition 14.2 *Let $\bigl(\mathcal{M}, U^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}\bigr)$ be a V-filtered $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$-module defined over $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. It is called good, if the following holds:*

- *For any compact subset $K \subset \mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, there exists $k_0 \geq 0$ such that the following holds:*

$$U^{(\lambda_0)}_{-k}\mathcal{M} = U^{(\lambda_0)}_{-k_0}\mathcal{M} \cdot t^{k-k_0}, \qquad U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k}\mathcal{M} = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k-k_0} U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k_0}\mathcal{M} \cdot \eth_t^j.$$

- *$U^{(\lambda_0)}_l\mathcal{M}$ is $V_0\mathcal{R}$-coherent.* ▮

Let A be a finite subset of $(\boldsymbol{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times \boldsymbol{C}$. Let $\pi : \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C} \longrightarrow (\boldsymbol{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times \boldsymbol{C}$ be the projection. We put $\tilde{A} := \pi^{-1}(A)$. For any real number $c \in \boldsymbol{R}$, we put as follows:

$$A^{(\lambda_0)}_c := \bigl\{ u \in \tilde{A} \,\big|\, c-1 < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) \leq c \bigr\}.$$

Definition 14.3 *A coherent $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathcal{M}$ is called specializable along X_0 at λ_0 for A, if the following holds:*

- *There exists a good V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ at λ_0.*
- *We have a map $f : A \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, which can be regarded as the function on $\tilde{A}$ or $A^{(\lambda_0)}_c$ $(c \in \boldsymbol{R})$, and we put as follows:*

$$b_U(s) := \prod_{u \in A^{(\lambda_0)}_0} \bigl(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\bigr)^{f(u)}.$$

  Then $b_U(t \cdot \eth_t - k\lambda)$ acts trivially on $U^{(\lambda_0)}_k / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k-1}$.

In such case, we say $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for (X_0, A, λ_0). If we would like to distinguish a V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ and a function f as above, we say that $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$. ▮

Note the following relation:

$$b_U(s - k\lambda) = \prod_{u \in A^{(\lambda_0)}_k} \bigl(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\bigr)^{f(u)}.$$

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 14.1 *If $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for (X_0, λ_0, A), then the $\mathcal{R}$-submodules and the $\mathcal{R}$-quotient modules are also specializable for (X_0, λ_0, A).* ▮

Recall the following lemma.

Lemma 14.2 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, \lambda_0, A, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$. Let m be a local section of $\mathcal{M}$ around λ_0. Then there exists a finite subset $S \subset \tilde{A}$ such that we have $m \cdot b_S(t\eth_t) \in m \cdot V_{-1}(\mathcal{R})$. Here we put as follows:*

$$b_S(s) := \prod_{u \in S} \bigl(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\bigr)^{f(u)}.$$

Proof $m \cdot \mathcal{R}$ is a submodule of $\mathcal{M}$. Thus $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ induces a good V-filtration of $m \cdot \mathcal{R}$. On the other hand, the good V-filtration of $\mathcal{R}$ induces the good V-filtration of $m \cdot \mathcal{R}$. Since the two good V-filtrations are equivalent, the result holds. ▮

14.1.2 Refinement and the decomposition

On $U^{(\lambda_0)}_k / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k-1}$, we have the filtration $\bigl\{ F_c \,\big|\, k-1 \leq c \leq k \bigr\}$ defined as follows:

$$F_c := \operatorname{Ker}\Bigl(\prod_{\substack{u \in A^{(\lambda_0)}_k, \\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) \leq c}} \bigl(t\eth_t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\bigr)^{f(u)} \Bigr) \subset U^{(\lambda_0)}_k / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k-1}.$$

Then we obtain the refinement of the filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ as follows: Let c be any real number. We take the integer k satisfying $k-1<c\leq k$. Let π_k denote the naturally defined projection $U^{(\lambda_0)}_k\longrightarrow U^{(\lambda_0)}_k/U^{(\lambda_0)}_{k-1}$. Then we put $U^{(\lambda_0)}_c:=\pi_k^{-1}(F_c)$. In the following, we put as follows for any real number $c\in\boldsymbol{R}$:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\mathcal{M}):=U^{(\lambda_0)}_c/U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}.$$

For any real number c, we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0):=\bigl\{u\in\tilde{A}\,\big|\,\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=c\bigr\},\qquad b_c(s):=\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)}\bigl(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^{f(u)}.$$

Then $b_c(t\eth_t)$ acts trivially on $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 14.3 *We have the decomposition on a neighbourhood of λ_0:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\mathcal{M})=\bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)}\mathbb{E}\bigl(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr).\tag{283}$$

Here $\mathbb{E}\bigl(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)$ denotes the kernel of $\bigl(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^N$ for any sufficiently large integer N.

Proof Let u_i $(i=1,2)$ be elements of $\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)$. Note we have $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u_1)\neq\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u_2)$ if $u_1\neq u_2$. Then the decomposition (283) immediately follows. ▮

We put as follows:

$$\psi^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}):=\mathbb{E}(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)).$$

For $\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, the function $\phi_\lambda:\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}$ is defined by $u\longmapsto\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)$.

Lemma 14.4 *Assume $|\lambda-\lambda_0|$ is sufficiently small. For any $c,c'\in\boldsymbol{R}$ such that $c\neq c'$, we have the following:*

$$\phi_\lambda\bigl(\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)\bigr)\cap\phi_\lambda\bigl(\mathcal{K}(A,c',\lambda_0)\bigr)=\emptyset.$$

Proof Since A is finite, the set $\bigl\{c\in\boldsymbol{R}\,\big|\,\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)\neq\emptyset\bigr\}$ is a discrete and periodic subset of $\boldsymbol{R}$. Then the lemma immediately follows. ▮

Lemma 14.5 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for (X_0,A,λ_0). If $|\lambda_1-\lambda_0|$ is sufficiently small, then $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for (X_0,A,λ_1). If there exists the V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ at λ_0 such that $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}$ is strict, then there exists the V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ at λ_1 such that $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_1)}}$ is strict.*

Proof For any real number $d\in\boldsymbol{R}$, we put as follows:

$$S(d):=\bigl\{c\in\boldsymbol{R}\,\big|\,\exists u\in\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0),\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_1,u)=d\bigr\}.$$

Since $|\lambda_1-\lambda_0|$ is small, we have $\bigl|S(d)\bigr|\leq 1$. First, let us consider the case $S(d)=\{c\}$. Let $\pi_c:U^{(\lambda_0)}_c\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c$ be the projection, and we put as follows:

$$U^{(\lambda_1)}_d:=\pi_c^{-1}\Bigl(\bigoplus_{\substack{u\in\mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0),\\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_1,u)\leq d}}\psi^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_{t,u}\Bigr).$$

Let us consider the case $S(d)=\emptyset$. In that case, we put $d_0:=\max\{d'\leq d\,|\,S(d')\neq\emptyset\}$, and we put $U^{(\lambda_1)}_d:=U^{(\lambda_1)}_{d_0}$. Then it is easy to check that $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ is the filtration we desired. ▮

Remark 14.2 *In the proof, the construction of $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ from $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ is also given.* ▮

14.1.3 Lemmas for uniqueness

Lemma 14.6 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$ and $(X_0, A', \lambda_0, U'^{(\lambda_0)}, f')$. Assume the strictness of $\mathrm{Gr}^{U'^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$. Then $U^{(\lambda_0)}_a \subset U'^{(\lambda_0)}_a$ for any $a \in \boldsymbol{R}$.*

Proof In this proof, we omit to denote (λ_0). We straightforwardly follow the argument given in the proof of (2) Lemma 3.3.4. in [42].

Since U and U' are good, there exists $l \geq 0$ such that $U'_{c-l} \subset U_c \subset U'_{c+l}$ for any c. Pick $m \in U_c\mathcal{M}$, and we take d as $m \in U'_d - U'_{<d}$. Note that $d \leq c + l$.

There exists a finite subset $S \subset \tilde{A}$ satisfying the following:

- For any element $u \in S$, the inequality $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) \leq c$ holds.
- We put $B_U(s) := \prod_{u \in S}\big(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)^{f(u)}$. Then $m \cdot B_U(t\eth_t) \in U_{<d-l} \subset U'_{<d}$.

On the other hand, we put as follows:

$$B'_U(s) := \prod_{u \in \mathcal{K}(A', d, \lambda_0)} \big(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)^{f'(u)}.$$

Then we have $m \cdot B'_U(t\eth_t) \in U'_{<d}$.

Assume $c < d$, and we will derive a contradiction. Since we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) = d$ for any element $u \in \mathcal{K}(A', d, \lambda_0)$, we have $\big\{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) \,\big|\, u \in S\big\} \cap \big\{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) \,\big|\, u \in \mathcal{K}(A', \lambda_0, d)\big\} = \emptyset$, where we regard $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$ as functions of λ. Thus we have g.c.d.$(B_U, B_{U'}) \in \boldsymbol{C}[\lambda] - \{0\}$. Hence there exists an element $g(\lambda) \in \boldsymbol{C}[\lambda] - \{0\}$ such that $m \cdot g(\lambda) \in U'_{<d}$. Due to the strictness of $\mathrm{Gr}^{U'}_d(\mathcal{M})$, we obtain $m \in U'_{<d}$, which contradicts our choice of d. Hence $c \geq d$. It implies $U_c \subset U'_c$. ∎

Lemma 14.7 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$ and $(X_0, A', \lambda_0, U'^{(\lambda_0)}, f')$. Assume the strictness of $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^{U'^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$. Then we have $U^{(\lambda_0)} = U'^{(\lambda_0)}$. If we have $f(u) \neq 0$ for any $u \in A$, then A is contained in A'.*

Proof By using Lemma 14.6, we obtain $U^{(\lambda_0)} = U'^{(\lambda_0)}$. Moreover, we obtain the two decomposition:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^U_c \mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{K}(A,c,\lambda_0)} \mathbb{E}\big(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big) = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{K}(A',c,\lambda_0)} \mathbb{E}\big(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big).$$

Thus we obtain the second claim. ∎

The second claim in Lemma 14.7 implies that we can take the unique minimal A if we impose the strictness to $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 14.8 *Assume the following:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$ and $(X_0, A', \lambda_0, U'^{(\lambda_0)}, f')$.*
- *The map $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0) : \tilde{A} \cup \tilde{A}' \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}$ is injective.*

Then we have $U^{(\lambda_0)} = U'^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Moreover, if we have $f(u) \neq 0$ for any $u \in A$, then we have $A \subset A'$.

Proof We omit to denote (λ_0). We put $A'' = A' \cup A$. The argument is essentially same as the proof of Lemma 14.6. Let us pick a section $g \in U_c$. We have the real number d determined by the condition $g \in U'_d - U'_{<d}$. Then we have the following:

$$g \cdot b_1\big(t \cdot \eth_t\big) \in U'_{<d}, \qquad b_1(s) := \prod_{u \in \mathcal{K}(A', \lambda_0, d)} \big(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big). \tag{284}$$

Since there exists a positive integer l such that $U_{c-l} \subset U'_{<d}$, there exists a finite subset $S \subset \big\{u \in \tilde{A} \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) \leq c\big\}$, such that the following holds:

$$g \cdot b_2\big(t \cdot \eth_t\big) \in U'_{<d}, \qquad b_2(s) := \prod_{u \in S} \big(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big). \tag{285}$$

Assume $c < d$, and we will derive a contradiction. We have $S \cap \mathcal{K}(A', \lambda_0, d) = \emptyset$. Then we obtain the following, due to the injectivity assumption:

$$\big\{-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) \,\big|\, u \in S\big\} \cap \big\{-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) \,\big|\, u \in \mathcal{K}(A', \lambda_0, d)\big\} = \emptyset. \tag{286}$$

It implies g.c.d.$\big(b_1(s), b_2(s)\big) = 1$. Then we obtain $f \in U'_{<d}$ from (284) and (285), but it contradicts our choice of d. Thus we obtain $c \geq d$. By symmetry we obtain $c = d$, and thus $U = U'$.

By the same argument as the proof of Lemma 14.7, we obtain the second claim. ∎

14.1.4 A lemma for strict compatibility of the morphism and $U^{(\lambda_0)}$

Proposition 14.1 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}), f_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $(X_0, A', \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{N}), f'_{\mathcal{N}})$ respectively. Let $\phi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a morphism of $\mathcal{R}$-modules. Assume $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{N})$ is strict.*

1. *$\phi\big(U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{M})\big)$ is contained in $U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{N})$.*
2. *Assume that $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$ is strict, and that the induced morphism $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\phi) : \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\mathcal{N})$ is strict, i.e., $\mathrm{Cok}(\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c(\phi))$ is strict. Then ϕ is strict with respect to the filtrations $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{N})$, namely, we have $U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathrm{Im}(\phi) = \phi\big(U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{N})\big)$.*

Proof Let us consider the image $\mathrm{Im}(\phi)$. The good V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ induces the good V-filtration $U^{(1)}$ on $\mathrm{Im}(\phi)$ via the surjection $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Im}(\phi)$. It satisfies the conditions in Definition 14.3 for (X_0, A, λ_0).

The good V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{N})$ induces the good V-filtration $U^{(2)}$ on $\mathrm{Im}(\phi)$ via the inclusion $\mathrm{Im}(\phi) \subset \mathcal{N}$. It satisfies the conditions in Definition 14.3 for (X_0, A', λ_0). Moreover $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(2)}}(\mathrm{Im}(\phi))$ is strict. Hence we obtain $U^{(1)}_c \subset U^{(2)}_c$, due to Lemma 14.6. It implies that the morphism ϕ preserves the filtration. Thus we obtain the first claim of Proposition 14.1.

To show the second claim of Proposition 14.1, let us consider the induced morphism $\phi' : U^{(\lambda_0)}_d / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow U^{(\lambda_0)}_d / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}(\mathcal{N})$.

Lemma 14.9 *The morphism ϕ' is strict and we have the following:*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\phi') \cap \Big(U^{(\lambda_0)}_{d'} / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}(\mathcal{N})\Big) = \phi'\Big(U^{(\lambda_0)}_{d'} / U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}(\mathcal{M})\Big). \tag{287}$$

Proof We note that there exists an open dense subset $Y \subset \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ such that the restrictions of $U^{(2)}$ and $U^{(1)}$ to $Y \times X$ are same, which is due to Lemma 14.8. Thus the equality (287) holds on $Y \times X_0$. Because $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{N})$ are strict, and because the morphisms $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\phi)$ is strict, we can derive that the equality (287) holds on $\mathcal{X}_0(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. ∎

Corollary 14.1 *Let c and d be real numbers such that $c < d$. Let h be an element of $U^{(\lambda_0)}_d(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\phi(h) \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{N})$. Then there exists an element $h_1 \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\phi(h - h_1) \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 14.9. ∎

Since the V-filtrations $U^{(i)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ on $\mathrm{Im}(\phi)$ are good, there exists a positive number l_0 such that $U^{(2)}_c \subset U^{(1)}_{c+l_0}$ for any real number c. It implies the following: For any element $g \in U^{(2)}_c$, there exists an element $\bar{g} \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{c+l_0}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $g = \phi(\bar{g})$.

Lemma 14.10 *There exists an element $\bar{g}_1 \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\phi(\bar{g} - \bar{g}_1)$ is contained in $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{c-l_0-1}(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof Due to Corollary 14.1, we have an element $\bar{g}_2 \in U_c^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\phi(\bar{g} - \bar{g}_2) \in U_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{N})$. By using Corollary 14.1 inductively, we obtain the element desired. Note that the set $\big\{d \in \boldsymbol{R} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}_d^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M}) \neq 0\big\} \cup \big\{d \in \boldsymbol{R} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}_d^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{N}) \neq 0\big\}$ is discrete in $\boldsymbol{R}$. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 14.1. Since $\phi(\bar{g} - \bar{g}_1)$ is contained in $U^{(2)}_{c-l_0-1}$, we can pick an element $\bar{g}_3 \in U_{c-1}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\phi(\bar{g}_3) = \phi(\bar{g} - \bar{g}_1)$. Then the element $\bar{g}_3 + \bar{g}_1$ is contained in $U_c^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$, and it satisfies the following:

$$\phi(\bar{g}_3 + \bar{g}_1) = \phi(\bar{g}) = g.$$

Thus g is contained in $U_c^{(1)}$, namely we obtain $U^{(2)} = U^{(1)}$. It means the strictness of ϕ with respect to the filtrations $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and $U^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{N})$. Therefore the proof of Proposition 14.1 is accomplished. ∎

14.1.5 $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\psi_{t,u}$

Definition 14.4 *When $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $(X_0, A, \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f)$ such that $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}$ is strict, we put as follows:*

$$\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}) := \psi_{t,u}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)}.$$

It is well defined due to Lemma 14.6. Clearly, it is strict. ∎

We have the nilpotent map $t\eth_t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$ on $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 14.11 *We have the decomposition:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}_c^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M}) = \bigoplus_{u \in \mathcal{K}(A,\lambda_0,c)} \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}). \tag{288}$$

Proof It is just a reformulation of (283). ∎

Lemma 14.12 *Assume that $\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1) \subset \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. We have the following:*

$$\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \mathcal{M}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} = \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_1)} \mathcal{M}. \tag{289}$$

Proof The construction of $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ from $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ is given in the proof of Lemma 14.5. Then (289) can be checked easily by using the uniqueness of the V-filtration $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ such that $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_1)}}$ is strict. ∎

Lemma 14.13 *Assume the following:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is specializable for $\big(X_0, A(\lambda_0), \lambda_0, U^{(\lambda_0)}, f^{(\lambda_0)}\big)$ for any $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.*
- *$\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}$ is strict for any $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.*
- *$f^{(\lambda_0)}(u) \neq 0$ for any $u \in A(\lambda_0)$.*

Then the following holds:

1. *If $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ is defined over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ and $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ is defined over $\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$. Then we have $U^{(\lambda_0)} = U^{(\lambda_1)}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \cap \Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$.*
2. *$A(\lambda_0)$ does not depend on $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 14.7. ∎

Definition 14.5 *If the assumption of Lemma 14.13 is satisfied, the $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathcal{M}$ is called specializable along X_0. In that case, the set A is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{M}, X_0)$ or $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{M}, t)$. The set $\tilde{A}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, X_0)$ or $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, t)$.* ∎

Remark 14.3 *Note that the strictness of* $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}$ $(\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C})$ *is contained in Definition* 14.5. ▮

Definition 14.6 *Assume* $\mathcal{M}$ *is specializable along* X_0*. Then* $\{\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{u,t}\mathcal{M} \mid \lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}\}$ *determines the globally defined* $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_0}$*-module, due to Lemma* 14.12*. We denote it by* $\psi_{t,u}\mathcal{M}$*.* ▮

Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be strictly specializable along X_0. Let $\phi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a morphism of $\mathcal{R}$-modules.

Lemma 14.14 *The morphism* ϕ *preserves the* V*-filtrations* $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ *at* λ_0 *for any* $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$*.*

Proof It immediately follows from the first claim in Proposition 14.1. ▮

Then we obtain the induced morphism $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\phi) : \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathcal{N})$.

Lemma 14.15 *It induces the morphisms* $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\phi) : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathcal{N})$*. They can be glued, and we obtain the morphism* $\psi_{t,u}(\phi) : \psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{N})$*.*

Proof Since the decomposition (288) is obtained as a generalized eigen decomposition, the first claim is clear. The second claim is also clear from the construction of $U^{(\lambda_1)}$ from $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ given in Lemma 14.5. ▮

Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0$ denote the element $(1,0) \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$. Then we have the naturally induced morphisms:

$$t : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}.$$

$$\eth_t : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u+\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}.$$

In particular, we put as follows:

$$\mathrm{can} = \eth_t : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,0}\mathcal{M},$$

$$\mathrm{var} = t : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}.$$

If $\mathcal{M}$ is specializable along X_0, then we have $t : \psi_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}$ and $\eth_t : \psi_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u+\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}$. In particular, we have $\mathrm{can} : \psi_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,0}\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathrm{var} : \psi_{t,0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}$.

14.1.6 Strictly specializable

Definition 14.7 *An* $\mathcal{R}$*-module* $\mathcal{M}$ *is called strictly specializable along* X_0*, if the following holds:*

1. *It is specializable along* X_0*.*
2. *For any* $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ *and for any* $c < 0$*, the morphism* $t : U^{(\lambda_0)}_c\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow U^{(\lambda_0)}_{c-1}\mathcal{M}$ *is isomorphic.*
3. *For any* $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ *and for any* $c > -1$*, the morphism* $\eth_t : \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c+1} \mathcal{M}$ *is isomorphic.* ▮

Definition 14.8

- *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *be strictly specializable along* X_0*. A morphism* $\phi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ *is called strictly specializable if* $\psi_{t,u}(\phi) : \psi_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u}\mathcal{N}$ *is strict, i.e., the cokernel* $\mathrm{Cok}\big(\psi_{t,u}(\phi)\big)$ *is strict.*
- *We have the category with strictly specializable* $\mathcal{R}$*-modules along* X_0 *and strictly specializable morphisms. We denote it by* $\mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$*. Note that* $X_0 = \{t = 0\}$*.*
- *Let* f *be a holomorphic function on* X*. An* $\mathcal{R}$*-module* $\mathcal{M}$ *is called strictly specializable along* f *if* $i_{f\,*}\mathcal{M}$ *is strictly specializable.* ▮

Here i_f denotes the naturally defined inclusion $X \longrightarrow X \times \boldsymbol{C}$.

Proposition 14.2 *Assume* $\mathcal{M}$ *is strictly specializable along* X_0*.*

1. *It we have a direct sum decomposition* $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$*, then* $\mathcal{M}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ *are strictly specializable.*

2. *Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is supported in $\mathcal{X}_0$. Then we have $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M} = 0$ for any $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We also have $\psi_{t,u}\mathcal{M} = 0$ if u does not contained in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$.*

3. *The following conditions are equivalent.*
   - $\mathrm{var} : \psi_{t,0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M}$ *is injective.*
   - *Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be a submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ such that the support of $\mathcal{M}'$ is contained in $\mathcal{X}_0$. Then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}'$ or 0.*
   - *Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be a submodule of $\mathcal{M}$ such that the support of $\mathcal{M}'$ is contained in $\mathcal{X}_0$. Assume that $\mathcal{M}' \in \mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$. Then $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$ or 0.*

4. *Assume* $\mathrm{can} : \psi_{t,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,0}\mathcal{M}$ *is surjective. Let $\mathcal{M}'' \in \mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$ be a quotient of $\mathcal{M}$ such that the support of $\mathcal{M}''$ is contained in $\mathcal{X}_0$. Then $\mathcal{M}'' = 0$.*

5. *The following conditions are equivalent.*
   - $\psi_{t,0}\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{can} \oplus \mathrm{Ker}\,\mathrm{var}$.
   - *We have the decomposition $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}' \oplus \mathcal{M}''$, where the support of $\mathcal{M}''$ is contained in X_0 and $\mathcal{M}'$ has neither submodules or quotients contained in $\mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$, whose support is contained in X_0.*

Proof The proof of the claims 1. 3. 4, 5. are same as those the proof of Proposition 3.3.9. in [42]. Let us see the claim 2.

(i) Since the multiplication $t\cdot$ is injective on $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$, we obtain $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0} = 0$. In particular, $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M} = 0$ if $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) < 0$.

(ii) Assume that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) \geq 0$ is not integer. We can take $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $-1 < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) - l < 0$. Then we obtain the surjection:

$$\eth_t^l : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-l\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}.$$

Thus $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M} = 0$ in this case.

(iii) Assume $u \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$, and $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) = 0$. Note that $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u) \neq 0$. Then the composite of the morphisms

$$\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\ t\ } \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\ \eth_t\ } \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}$$

is isomorphic. Then we obtain $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}$ in this case.

(iv) If $u \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$ and $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) \geq 0$, then it can be reduced to the case (iii) by the argument in (ii).

Then we obtain $V_0\mathcal{M} = \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,0}\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Ker}(t : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M})$. Since $\eth_t^k : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,0} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,k\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}$ is isomorphic, we obtain $\mathcal{M} = i_+\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,0}\mathcal{M}$. ▮

Let $\mathcal{S}^2_{X_0}(X,t)$ denote the subcategory of $\mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$, whose objects have the supports contained in $\mathcal{X}_0$.

Corollary 14.2 *We have the equivalence $\mathcal{S}^2_{\mathcal{X}_0}(X,t) \simeq \big(\text{strict } \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_0}\text{-modules}\big)$.* ▮

Definition 14.9

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is strictly S-decomposable along X_0, if it is strictly specializable along X_0 and $\psi_{t,0} = \mathrm{Im(can)} \oplus \mathrm{Ker(var)}$.*
- *$\mathcal{M}$ is S-decomposable at P, if for any holomorphic function f, and $i_{f\,+}\mathcal{M}$ is strictly S-decomposable at $(x,0)$.*
- *$\mathcal{M}$ is strictly S-decomposable if $\mathcal{M}$ is strictly S-decomposable at any $x \in X$.* ▮

Lemma 14.16 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ be $\mathcal{R}$-modules, which are strictly S-decomposable along X_0. Let $f : \mathcal{M}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a morphism. Assume the following:*

- *For any $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, there exists a number $h(\lambda_0) < 0$ such that the induced morphism $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}') \longrightarrow V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic.*

- *We have* $\psi_{t,0}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$ *and* $\psi_{t,0}(\mathcal{M}') = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$.

Then f *is isomorphic around a neighbourhood of* X_0.

Proof We have only to show that $V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M}') \longrightarrow V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic for any h and for any λ_0.

In the case $h < h(\lambda_0)$, the coincidence $V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M}') \longrightarrow V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M})$ follows from $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}') \simeq V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and the uniqueness of the V-filtration whose associated graded module is strict.

In the case $h(\lambda_0) \leq h < 0$, we have a large integer N such that $h - N < h(\lambda_0)$. We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M}') \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "t^N"'] & V^{(\lambda_0)}_h(\mathcal{M}) \arrow[d, "t^N"'] \\
V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h-N}(\mathcal{M}') \arrow[r] & V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h-N}(\mathcal{M}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since the both of the vertical arrows and the lower horizontal arrow are isomorphic, the upper vertical arrow is also isomorphic.

In particular, we know $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathcal{M}') \simeq V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathcal{M})$.

Since $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are strictly S-decomposable, and since we have $\psi_{t,0} = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$ for both of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$, they are generated by $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$. Thus we obtain the surjectivity of the morphism f. Since we have $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathrm{Ker}\, f) = 0$, the support of $\mathrm{Ker}(f)$ is contained in X_0. Then we obtain $\mathrm{Ker}(f) = 0$ due to Proposition 14.2. ∎

Corollary 14.3 *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{M}'$ *be* $\mathcal{R}$*-modules, which are strictly* S*-decomposable along* X_0*, and* $\psi_{t,0}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$ *and* $\psi_{t,0}(\mathcal{M}') = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$ *hold. Let* $f : \mathcal{M}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ *be a morphism. Assume that the support of the cokernel of* f *is contained in* X_0*. Then* f *is isomorphic.*

Proof For any λ_0, there exists a sufficiently negative number $h(\lambda_0)$ such that $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Cok}(f) = 0$. It means $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}') \simeq V^{(\lambda_0)}_{h(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$. Thus we can apply Lemma 14.16. ∎

14.1.7 $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\widetilde{\psi}(\mathcal{M})$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$-module, which is strictly specializable along X_0.

Definition 14.10 *Let* $u = (a, \alpha)$ *be an element of* $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, t)$ *such that* $u \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$*. The* $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_0}$*-module* $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$ *is defined as follows: Let us pick an integer* b *such that* $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u - b \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_0) = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) - b < 0$*. Then we put* $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}) := \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathcal{M})$.

It is well defined in the following sense: For any non-negative integer N*, we have the canonical isomorphism:*

$$t^N : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0} \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-(b+N)\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}.$$

∎

Let u be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, t)$. Let us consider the following set:

$$S(u) := \bigl\{\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^* \bigm| \exists b \in \mathbb{Z},\ \text{s.t. } \mathfrak{e}\bigl(\lambda, u - b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0\bigr) = 0,\ \mathfrak{p}\bigl(\lambda_0, u - b\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0\bigr) \geq 0\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 14.17 *The set* $S(u)$ *is discrete in* $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$.

Proof The set $S(u)$ is contained in the following set:

$$\bigcup_{b\in\mathbb{Z}} \bigl\{\lambda \bigm| \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u - b\boldsymbol{\delta}_0) = 0\bigr\}.$$

Then the discreteness of $S(u) \cap \boldsymbol{C}^*$ in $\boldsymbol{C}^*$ can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 7.65.

In a neighbourhood U of $\lambda = 0$, $S(u) \cap U$ is contained in the following finite set:

$$\bigcup_{0 \leq b \leq \mathfrak{p}(0,u)+1} \bigl\{ \lambda \,\big|\, \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u - b\boldsymbol{\delta}_0) = 0 \bigr\}.$$

Then we obtain the discreteness of $S(u)$ in $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. ■

Lemma 14.18 *Let* λ_0 *be an element of* $\boldsymbol{C}^* - S$. *Then we have the canonical isomorphism* $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \simeq \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Proof Since λ_0 is an element of $\boldsymbol{C}^*$, the eigenvalues of the endomorphism $s = t \cdot \eth_t$ cannot be 0. It implies that the morphisms $t : \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{(\lambda_0)}$ are isomorphic for any u. Thus we have the isomorphism $t^N : \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{(\lambda_0)}$. It gives the isomorphism desired. ■

We have the following straightforward corollary of Lemma 14.18.

Corollary 14.4 *Let* u *be an element of* $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, t)$. *Let* λ_0 *and* λ_1 *be a point. Assume that* $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \cap \Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1) \subset \boldsymbol{C} - S(u)$. *Then we have the canonical isomorphism* $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}) \simeq \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_1)}(\mathcal{M})$. ■

Definition 14.11 *The* $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}_0}$*-module* $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$ *is defined by* $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} := \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$.
It is well defined due to Corollary 14.4. ■

Lemma 14.19 *We have the canonical inclusion* $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Proof Recall that we have assumed $u \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$. Then the induced morphism $t : \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is injective. Thus we have the injection $t^N : \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \psi_{t,u-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{(\lambda_0)}$. It gives the desired inclusion. ■

Corollary 14.5 *We have the canonical inclusion* $\psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$. ■

14.2 Specialization of the pairing of Sabbah

We recall the specialization of sesqui-linear pairing introduced by Sabbah, with minor generalization. We recommend the reader to read the sections 1.5–1.7 and the section 3.5–3.7 of [42]. We consider the left $\mathcal{R}$-modules in this subsection.

14.2.1 $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$-module

We put $\overline{\eth}_i := -\lambda^{-1} \cdot \overline{\partial}_i$, and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}^{\dagger\sharp}}[\overline{\eth}_i]$, where $\mathcal{X}^{\dagger} = X^{\dagger} \times \boldsymbol{C}^*$. We use the map $\sigma : \boldsymbol{C}^* \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{C}^*$ given by $\sigma(\lambda) = -\overline{\lambda}^{-1}$.

Let U be a subset of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a left $\mathcal{R}$-module over $X \times U$. Then the left $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$-module structure on $\sigma^*\mathcal{M}$ on $X^{\dagger} \times \sigma(U)$ is given. Let f be a section of $\mathcal{O}_{X^{\dagger} \times \sigma(U)}$, and v be a section of $\sigma^*(\mathcal{M})$.

$$f \bullet v := \overline{\sigma^*(f)} \cdot v, \qquad \overline{\eth}_i \bullet v := \eth_i \cdot v.$$

Note the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\eth}_i \bullet (f \bullet v) &= \overline{\eth}_i \bullet \bigl(\overline{\sigma^*(f)} \cdot v\bigr) = \eth_i \cdot \bigl(\overline{\sigma^*(f)} \cdot v\bigr) = \overline{\sigma^*(f)} \cdot \eth_i \cdot v + \bigl(\lambda \partial_i \overline{\sigma^*(f)}\bigr) \cdot v \\ &= f \bullet (\overline{\eth}_i \bullet v) + \overline{\sigma^*(-\lambda^{-1} \cdot \overline{\partial}_i f)} \cdot v = f \bullet (\overline{\eth}_i \bullet v) + \overline{\sigma^*\bigl(\overline{\eth}_i(f)\bigr)} \cdot v = f \bullet (\overline{\eth}_i \bullet v) + \bigl(\overline{\eth}_i(f)\bigr) \bullet v. \quad (290)\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain the well defined left $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$-module structure on $\sigma^*\mathcal{M}$. We often use the notation $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ instead of $\sigma^*\mathcal{M}$.

Notation We use the following notation: Let $\pi_U : X \times U \longrightarrow X$ denote the projection. Then we put $\mathcal{M}_U := \pi_{U\,*}\mathcal{M}$, and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_U := \pi_{U\,*}\sigma^*\mathcal{M}$.

14.2.2 Preliminary I

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. In this subsubsection, U denotes an open subset $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ for some small positive number ϵ_0. Let us consider the case $X=X_0\times\boldsymbol{C}$. Let t be the coordinate of $\boldsymbol{C}$. Let $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ be objects of $\mathcal{S}^2(X,t)$. Let $C_U:\mathcal{M}'_U\longrightarrow\overline{\mathcal{M}''}_U\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}_X^U$ be a sesqui-linear pairing. We recall the construction of Sabbah to obtain the specialization along t:

$$\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}C_U:\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}'_U\otimes\overline{\psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}''}_U\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}^U_{X_0}.$$

Let W_0 be an open subset of X_0. Let m be a section of $\mathcal{M}'_U$ and μ be a section of $\mathcal{M}''_U$ on $W=W_0\times\Delta_t$. Let us pick a C^∞ $(n-1,n-1)$-form ϕ on W_0 whose support is compact, and a C^∞-function χ on Δ_t such that $\chi=1$ around the origin $O\in\Delta$ and that the support of χ is compact.

For any integer $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s):=\begin{cases}\big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}t^k\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\phi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\big\rangle, & (k\geq 0),\\[1ex] \big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{|k|}\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\phi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\big\rangle, & (k<0).\end{cases}$$

Then $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)$ is a $H(\boldsymbol{A}\cap U)$-valued holomorphic function defined on the half plane $\big\{s\in\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,\mathrm{Re}(s)>\sigma_0-2^{-1}|k|\big\}$, where σ_0 denotes some real number.

Lemma 14.20 *In the case $k\geq 0$, we have the following:*

$$\lambda\cdot\big(s+k+\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)=\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m',\bar{\mu}),\phi}+F. \tag{291}$$

Here we put $m':=(-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))\cdot m$, and F denotes an entire function of the variable s.

Proof Let us consider the following:

$$\Big\langle\big(-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}t^k\phi\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle=\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}t^k\phi\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle. \tag{292}$$

The left hand side of (292) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\text{L.H.S.}=\Big\langle C\big((-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))\cdot m,\bar{\mu}\big),\ |t|^{2s}t^k\phi\cdot\chi(t)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle=\Big\langle C(m',\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}t^k\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle.$$

The right hand side of (292) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{R.H.S.}=\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big((t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))\cdot|t|^{2s}t^k\big)\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle&\\ +\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}t^{k+1}\cdot\phi\cdot\lambda\cdot\partial_t\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle.&\end{aligned} \tag{293}$$

Since we have $\partial_t\chi(t)=0$ around $t=0$, the second term in (293) is entire. The first term in (293) is as follows:

$$\big((s+k)\cdot\lambda+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\cdot t^k\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle.$$

Then (291) follows immediately. ∎

Lemma 14.21 *In the case $k\geq 0$, we have the following equality:*

$$-\lambda^{-1}\cdot\Big(s+k+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Big)\cdot\mathcal{I}^{(-k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)=\mathcal{I}^{(-k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}'),\phi}+F. \tag{294}$$

Here we put $\mu'=\big(-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot\mu$, and F denotes an entire function of s.

Proof Similarly we consider the following:

$$\Big\langle \big(-\overline{\eth}_t\bar{t}+\sigma^{*}\overline{\big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)}\big)\cdot C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle \\ =\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big(\bar{t}\overline{\eth}_t+\sigma^{*}\overline{\big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)}\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle. \quad (295)$$

The left hand side of (295) is as follows:

$$\text{L.H.S.}=\Big\langle C\big(m,\ \overline{(-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))\cdot\mu}\big),\ |t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle.$$

The right hand side of (295) is as follows:

$$\text{R.H.S.}=\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \Big(\big(\bar{t}\overline{\eth}_t+\sigma^{*}\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\Big)\cdot\phi\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle \\ -\lambda^{-1}\Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k+1}\cdot\phi\cdot\overline{\eth}_t\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle. \quad (296)$$

The second term of (296) is entire. To see the first term of (296), note the following:

$$\big(\bar{t}\overline{\eth}_t+\sigma^{*}\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}=\big(-\lambda^{-1}\cdot(s+k)+\sigma^{*}\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}$$

Here we have $\sigma^{*}(\bar{\lambda})=-\lambda^{-1}$. Thus it is same as the following:

$$-\lambda^{-1}\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\Big(s+k+\sigma^{*}\overline{\Big(\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Big)}\Big)=-\lambda^{-1}\cdot|t|^{2s}\bar{t}^{k}\cdot\Big(s+k+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Big)$$

Here we have used the following equality:

$$\sigma^{*}\overline{\Big(\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Big)}=\bar{\alpha}\cdot(-\lambda)-a-\alpha\cdot(-\lambda^{-1})=-\bar{\alpha}\cdot\lambda-a+\alpha\cdot\lambda^{-1}=\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}.$$

Then (294) follows immediately. ∎

14.2.3 Preliminary II

Let m be an element of $U_c^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}$ such that $0\neq\pi_c(m)\in\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}$ via the projection $\pi_c:U_c^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}_c^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}\mathcal{M}$. Let $b_m(s)$ be the Bernstein polynomial of m at λ_0, i.e. $b_m(-\eth_t\cdot t)m\in V_{-1}\mathcal{R}\cdot m$. Then $b_m(s)$ is of the following form:

$$b_m(s)=\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0)\big)^{\nu(u_0)}\cdot\prod_{u\in S_0}\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^{\nu(u)}.$$

Here S_0 denotes a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)<c$ for any $u\in S_0$. Then we put as follows for any positive integer σ:

$$B_m^{(\sigma)}(s):=\prod_{\nu=0}^{\sigma}b_m(s+\nu\lambda).$$

Lemma 14.22 *There exists a finite subset $S_1(\sigma)\subset\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ such that the following holds:*

- $B_m^{(\sigma)}(s)=\prod_{u\in S_1(\sigma)}\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^{\nu'(u)}$.
- *For any $u\in S_1(\sigma)$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\leq c$. If $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=c$, then $u=u_0$.*

Moreover, there exists a positive number C such that $\nu'(u)\leq C$ for any $u\in\bigcup_{\sigma}S_1(\sigma)$.

Proof It is clear from our construction. ∎

Lemma 14.23 *We have the following equality:*

$$\Big(\prod_{u\in S_1(\sigma)}\lambda\cdot\big(s+k+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^{\nu'(u)}\Big)\cdot\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)=\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m',\bar{\mu}),\phi}+\text{an entire function.}\tag{297}$$

Here $m'=B^{(\sigma)}_m(-\eth_t t)\cdot m$. *The first term in the right hand side is holomorphic on the half plane* $\big\{s\in\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,\mathrm{Re}(s)>\sigma_0-\sigma-2^{-1}|k|\big\}$.

Proof The equality (297) follows from Lemma 14.20. By the construction of $B^{(\sigma)}_m$, we have the following for some $P\in V_0(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}})$:

$$B^{(\sigma)}_m(-\eth_t t)\cdot m=t^{\sigma}P\cdot m.$$

Hence $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m',\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ in Lemma 14.23 is holomorphic on the half plane $\big\{s\in\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,\mathrm{Re}(s)>\sigma_0-\sigma-2^{-1}|k|\big\}$. ∎

Let $Z(f)$ denote the zero set of a holomorphic function f.

Lemma 14.24 *We regard* $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)$ *as a 'function' of* $(s,\lambda)\in\boldsymbol{C}_s\times U$.

- $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ *is meromorphic on* $\boldsymbol{C}_s\times U$.
- *There exists a discrete subset* S_2 *of* $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ *such that the pole of* $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ *is contained in the following:*

  $$\bigcup_{u\in S_2}Z\big(s+k+\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big).$$

  The order of the poles are bounded. For any element $u\in S_2$, *we have* $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\leq c$. *If* $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=c$, *then* $u=u_0$.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 14.22 and Lemma 14.23. ∎

14.2.4 Preliminary III

Let μ be an element of $U^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_d\mathcal{M}$ such that $0\neq\pi_d(\mu)\in\psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u_1}\mathcal{M}$ via the projection $U^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_d\mathcal{M}\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}}_d\mathcal{M}$. Let b_μ be a Bernstein polynomial of μ at $\sigma(\lambda_0)$. Then it is of the following form:

$$b_\mu(s)=\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\big)^{\nu(u_1)}\cdot\prod_{u\in S_3}\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^{\nu(u)}.$$

Here S_3 is a subset of $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. For any element $u\in S_3$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(-\sigma(\lambda_0),u)<d$. Then we put as follows for any positive integer σ:

$$B^{(\sigma)}_\mu(s):=\prod_{\nu=0}^{\sigma}b_\mu(s+\nu\lambda).$$

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 14.25 *There exists a finite subset* $S_4(\sigma)\subset\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$ *satisfying the following:*

- $B^{(\sigma)}_\mu(s)=\prod_{u\in S_4(\sigma)}\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^{\nu'(u)}$.
- *For any element* $u\in S_4(\sigma)$, *we have* $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0),u)\leq d$. *If* $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0),u)=d$, *then* $u=u_1$.

Moreover, there exists a positive number C *such that* $\nu'(u)\leq C$ *for any elements* $u\in\bigcup_\sigma S_4(\sigma)$. ∎

Lemma 14.26 $\prod_{u\in S_1}\big(-\lambda^{-1}\cdot(s+k+\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))^{\nu'(u)}\big)\cdot\mathcal{I}^{(-k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)$ *is holomorphic on the half plane* $\big\{s\in\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,\mathrm{Re}(s)>\sigma_0-\sigma-2^{-1}|k|\big\}$.

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 14.23. ∎

Corollary 14.6 *$\mathcal{I}^{(-k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ is meromorphic on $\boldsymbol{C} \times U$. There exists a discrete subset $S_5 \subset \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$ such that the pole of $\mathcal{I}^{(-k)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ is contained in $\bigcup_{u \in S_5} Z\big(s + k + \lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)$. The orders of the poles are bounded. For any $u \in S_5$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u) \leq d$. If $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u) = d$, then $u = u_0$.*

Proof Similar to Lemma 14.24. ∎

14.2.5 The construction of the specialization $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u} C$

Let $[m]$ be a section of $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u_0}\mathcal{M}'$ on $W_0 \times U$, and m be a section of $\mathcal{M}'$ on $W_0 \times \Delta_t \times U$ such that $\pi_c(m) = [m]$. Here we put $c = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_0)$ and π_c denotes the projection $U^{(\lambda_0)}_c\mathcal{M}' \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}_c \mathcal{M}'$, as in the subsubsection 14.2.3. Let $[\mu]$ be a section of $\psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u_0}\mathcal{M}''$ on $W_0 \times \sigma(U)$, and μ be a section of $\mathcal{M}''$ on $W_0 \times \Delta_t \times \sigma(U)$ such that $\pi_d(\mu) = [\mu]$. Here we put $d = \mathfrak{p}\big(\sigma(\lambda_0), u_0\big)$ and π_d denotes the projection $U^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_d\mathcal{M}'' \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}}_d \mathcal{M}''$ as in the subsubsection 14.2.4.

Then we put as follows:

$$\big\langle \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u_0} C\big([m], [\bar{\mu}]\big),\, \phi \big\rangle := \mathrm{Res}_{Z(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0))}\big(\mathcal{I}^{(0)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)\big). \tag{298}$$

Here the residue at $Z(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_0))$ means the coefficient of $(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_0))^{-1}$ for the development $\sum a_i \cdot (s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_0))^i$.

Recall that we have a discrete subset S of $\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$ such that the poles of $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\phi}(s)$ is contained in $\bigcup_{u \in S} Z(s + \lambda^{-1} \cdot e(\lambda, u))$.

Lemma 14.27 *We may assume $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) \neq \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u_0)$ for any $u \in S - \{u_0\}$.*

Proof We have the following equality in general:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) + \mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u) = a + 2\,\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_0 \cdot \bar{\alpha}) + a + 2\,\mathrm{Re}(-\overline{\lambda}_0^{-1} \cdot \bar{\alpha}) = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\Big(a + \lambda_0 \cdot \bar{\alpha} - \lambda_0^{-1} \cdot \alpha\Big) \\ = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\big(\lambda_0^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{299}$$

Assume that $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) = \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u_0)$. Then we obtain the equality from (299):

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) + \mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u) = \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_0) + \mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u_0). \tag{300}$$

In the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) > \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_0)$, we can exclude u from S because of Lemma 14.24. In the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) < \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_0)$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u) > \mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), u_0)$ due to the equality (300). Then we can exclude u due to Corollary 14.6. ∎

Lemma 14.28 *The right hand side of* (298) *gives a holomorphic function on a neighbourhood of λ_0 in U.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 14.27. ∎

Lemma 14.29 (298) *is well defined.*

Proof Let m_1 denote another lift of $[m]$. Then the non-trivial pole of $\mathcal{I}^{(0)}_{C(m-m_1,\bar{\mu}),\phi}$ is contained in the following:

$$\bigcup_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)<c} Z(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)).$$

Thus the residue at $Z(s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_0))$ is 0. Hence (298) is independent of a choice of the lift of $[m]$. Similarly, it can be shown that (298) is independent of a choice of the lift of $[\mu]$. ∎

Thus we obtain the specialization morphism

$$\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u} C : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}'_U \otimes \overline{\psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}''}_U \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^U_{X_0}.$$

We put $N = -\eth_t t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_0)$, which induces the nilpotent map on $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u_0}\mathcal{M}$ and $\psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u_0}\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 14.30 *We have the following equality:*

$$\psi_{t,u_0}^{(\lambda_0)} C\big(N[m],[\bar{\mu}]\big) = (i\lambda)^2 \cdot \psi_{t,u_0}^{(\lambda_0)} C\big([m],\bar{N}[\bar{\mu}]\big).$$

Proof By definition, we have the following:

$$\big\langle \psi_{t,u_0}^{(\lambda_0)} C(N[m],[\bar{\mu}]),\, \phi \big\rangle = \mathrm{Res}_{Z(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0))} \Big\langle C(Nm,\bar{\mu}), |t|^{2s}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle$$

We have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\langle C(Nm,\bar{\mu}), |t|^{2s}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot(|t|^{2s}\cdot\phi\cdot\chi)\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big((t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))|t|^{2s}\big)\cdot\phi\cdot\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle + \text{an entire function.} \qquad (301)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have the following:

$$\big\langle \psi_{t,u_0}^{(\lambda_0)} C\big([m],\bar{N}[\bar{\mu}]\big),\, \phi \big\rangle = \mathrm{Res}_{Z(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0))} \Big\langle C(m,\bar{N}\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\phi\cdot\chi\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle$$

We have the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\langle C(m,\bar{N}\bar{\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\phi\cdot\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle &= \Big\langle C(m,\overline{(-\eth_t t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0))\cdot\mu}),\ |t|^{2s}\phi\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big(-\bar{\eth}_t\bar{t}+\sigma^*\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\phi\cdot\chi\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle C(m,\bar{\mu}),\ \big(\big(-\bar{\eth}_t\bar{t}+\sigma^*\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_0)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}\big)\cdot\phi\cdot\chi\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Big\rangle + \text{an entire function.} \qquad (302)\end{aligned}$$

We have the following relation:

$$\big(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s} = \big(s\lambda+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s} = \lambda\cdot\big(s+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s}.$$

We also have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\overline{t\eth}_t+\varphi\big(\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s} = \big(s\cdot\sigma^*\bar{\lambda}+\sigma^*\big(\overline{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}\big)\big)\cdot|t|^{2s} &= -\lambda^{-1}\cdot|t|^{2s}\cdot\big(s+\sigma^*\big(\overline{\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}\big)\big) \\ &= -\lambda^{-1}\cdot|t|^{2s}\cdot\big(s+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big) \qquad (303)\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain the relation desired. ▮

14.2.6 The induced pairing on $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$

The pairing on $\psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$ is not so good, if u is not contained in $\boldsymbol{R}\times\{0\}\subset\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. We modify it to construct the induced pairing:

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}C : \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}\otimes\overline{\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}_{X_0}^{U}.$$

Lemma 14.31 *Let m be a section of $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and μ be a section of $\psi_{t,u}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}(\mathcal{M})$. Then we have the equality:*

$$\psi_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{(\lambda_0)} C\big([t\cdot m],\overline{[t\cdot\mu]}\big) = \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)} C\big([m],\overline{[\mu]}\big). \qquad (304)$$

Proof We have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}^{(0)}_{C(t\cdot m,\overline{t\cdot\mu}),\varphi}(s) = \big\langle C(t\cdot m,\overline{t\cdot\mu}),\varphi\wedge|t|^{2s}\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\big\rangle &= \big\langle C(m,\overline{\mu}),\varphi\wedge|t|^{2(s+1)}\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\big\rangle \\ &= \mathcal{I}^{(0)}_{C(m,\bar{\mu}),\varphi}(s+1). \qquad (305)\end{aligned}$$

Then the formula (304) immediately follows. $\blacksquare$

Let m be a section of $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$, and μ be a section of $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M})$. We pick a sufficiently large integer N and $m_1 \in \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-N\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mu_1 \in \psi^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{t,u-N\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathcal{M})$ corresponding to m and μ respectively. Then the pairing $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}C(m,\bar{\mu})$ is defined to be $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}C(m_1,\overline{\mu_1})$.

Corollary 14.7 *It is well defined.*

Proof It immediately follows from the definition of $\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M})$ and Lemma 14.31. $\blacksquare$

14.2.7 The induced pairings $\psi_{t,u}C$ and $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}C$

Corollary 14.8 *We obtain the induced pairings:*

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}C : \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}')_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}'')}_{\boldsymbol{A}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^{\boldsymbol{A}}_{X_0},$$

$$\psi_{t,u}C : \psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}')_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{\psi_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}'')}_{\boldsymbol{A}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^{\boldsymbol{A}}_{X_0}.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 14.29 and Corollary 14.7. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 14.9 *We have the following relations:*

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u_0}C\big(N[m],[\bar{\mu}]\big) = (i\lambda)^2 \cdot \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u_0}C\big([m],\bar{N}[\bar{\mu}]\big), \quad \psi_{t,u_0}C\big(N[m],[\bar{\mu}]\big) = (i\lambda)^2 \cdot \psi_{t,u_0}C\big([m],\bar{N}[\bar{\mu}]\big).$$

Here we put $N := -\eth_t t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 14.30. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 14.10 *We have the induced pairing:*

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}C : P_h \operatorname{Gr}^W_h \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}'_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{P_h \operatorname{Gr}^W_{-h} \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{M}''}_{\boldsymbol{A}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^{\boldsymbol{A}}_{X_0}.$$

Here W denotes the weight filtration induced by N in Corollary 14.9, and $P_k \operatorname{Gr}^W_h$ denote the primitive part of the associated graded modules.

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 14.9. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 14.11 *We have the specialization of a $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C)$, where $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ are strictly specializable.* $\blacksquare$

14.2.8 Uniqueness of the pairing

Let Z be a closed irreducible subset of X. Let $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ be strictly specializable $\mathcal{R}$-modules, whose supports are Z. We assume that the morphisms can for $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ are surjective. Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}^*$, and let U be an open subset $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ for some sufficiently small $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Let $C_a : \mathcal{M}'_U \otimes \overline{\mathcal{M}''}_{\sigma(U)} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^U_X$ $(a = 1,2)$ be sesqui-linear pairings.

Let $Z' \subset Z$ be a Zariski open subset.

Lemma 14.32 *Assume that λ_0 is generic with respect to $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}',t) \cup \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}'',t) \cup \{(0,0)\}$. Assume that we have $C_1 = C_2$ on Z'. Then we have $C_1 = C_2$ on Z.*

Proof We follow the argument of Sabbah (Proposition 3.6 in [42]). Since it is a local property, we may assume that there exits a holomorphic function f such that $f^{-1}(0) \cap Z \supset Z - Z'$. We have only to show the coincidence of the pairings:

$$i_{f\,+}C_a : i_{f\,+}\mathcal{M}'_U \otimes \overline{i_{f\,+}\mathcal{M}''}_U \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}^U_X, \quad (a = 1,2).$$

Thus we may assume that $X = X_0 \times \boldsymbol{C}$ and $f = t$ is the coordinate of $\boldsymbol{C}$.

Let m' and m'' be sections of $\mathcal{M}'_U[\eth_t]$ and $\mathcal{M}''_{\sigma(U)}[\eth_t]$ respectively. We put $A(m', \overline{m''}) := C_1(m', \overline{m''}) - C_2(m', \overline{m''})$. Since the support of $A(m', \overline{m''})$ is contained in X_0, we have the following development:

$$A(m', m'') = \sum_{a+b \leq p} \eta_{a,b} \cdot \eth_t^a \cdot \overline{\eth}_t^b \cdot \delta_{X_0}.$$

Here $\eta_{a,b}$ denotes the $H(U \cap \boldsymbol{A})$-valued distributions on X_0. We have only to show $\eta_{a,b} = 0$ for any a and b.

Let us consider the case $m' \in V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$. We have a finite subset $S \subset \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{M}, 0, t)$ such that the following holds:

- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) < 0$ for any element $u \in S$.
- We put $B(x) := \prod_{u \in S} \big(x + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)$. Then we have $B(-\eth_t t) \cdot m' = P \cdot t^{p+1} \cdot m'$. Here P denotes an element of $V_0 \mathcal{R}_{X \times \boldsymbol{C}}$.

Then we have the following vanishing:

$$B(-\eth_t t) \cdot A(m', m'') = P \cdot t^{p+1} \cdot A(m', m'') = 0.$$

Note that we have the following:

$$\big(-\eth_t t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big) \cdot \eth_t^a \cdot \delta_{X_0} = \big(a\lambda + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big) \cdot \eth_t^a \cdot \delta_{X_0} = \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u + a \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_0) \cdot \eth_t^a \cdot \delta_{X_0}.$$

Note we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u - a\boldsymbol{\delta}_0) < 0$. Then we have $a\lambda_0 + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0, u) \neq 0$ due to the genericness of λ_0. Thus we obtain $\eta_{a,b} = 0$ in the case $m' \in V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$. Since $\mathcal{M}'$ is generated by $V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}'$ around λ_0, the general case can be reduced to the case $m' \in V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$. ▮

Proposition 14.3 *Assume that we have $C_1 = C_2$ on Z'. Then we have $C_1 = C_2$ on Z.*

Proof Let ϕ be a test function. Since $C_i(m', \overline{m''})(\phi)$ are holomorphic functions on $\boldsymbol{A}$, we have only to show that the coincidence on a neighbourhood of a generic λ. Thus the proposition follows from Lemma 14.32. ▮

15 Prolongation of $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathcal{E}$

We put $X = \Delta^n$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. The sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ with λ-connection $\mathbb{D}$ can be naturally regarded as the left $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$-module. By tensoring $\bigwedge^n \Omega_{X-D}$, we obtain the right $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$-module. In this section, we use the right $\mathcal{R}$-module structure, if we do not mention. For simplicity, we omit to denote '$\otimes \bigwedge^n \Omega_{X-D}$'. The author hopes that there are no confusion.

15.1 Naive prolongment ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ and the filtrations

15.1.1 Definition

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Pick $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that $b_i \notin \mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)$ for each i.

$(C1)$ Let ϵ_0 be a sufficiently small positive number such that we have ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

We have the natural inclusion $j : X - D \longrightarrow X$, which induces $j : \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. We have the subsheaf ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $j_* \mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)}$ given as follows:

$${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} := \bigcup_{a=1}^{\infty} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{l} z_i\Big)^{-a} \cdot {}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}.$$

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 15.1

- $^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is characterized as follows:*

$$\Gamma\bigl(U,{}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)=\Bigl\{f\in\Gamma(U,j_*\mathcal{E}),\,\Bigl|\,|f|\leq C_1\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}|z_i|^{-C_2},\quad\bigl(\exists C_1,C_2>0\bigr)\Bigr\},\qquad\bigl(U\subset\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\bigr).$$

- *Let $\boldsymbol{b}'$ and ϵ_0' be other choices. We pick $0<\epsilon_0''<\min(\epsilon_0',\epsilon_0'')$. Then we obtain two sheaves $^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b},\epsilon_0)$ and $^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}',\epsilon_0')$. Then we have the following:*

$$^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b},\epsilon_0)_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0'')}={}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}',\epsilon_0')_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0'')}.$$

▮

In the following, we omit to denote $\boldsymbol{b}$ and ϵ_0.

Corollary 15.1 *Pick $\lambda_1\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, and ϵ_1 such that $\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)\subset\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Then we have the following:*

$$^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}={}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_1)}.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 15.1. ▮

Definition 15.1 *We define the sheaf $^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ by the following condition:*

$$^{\square}\mathcal{E}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}={}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

It is well defined, due to Corollary 15.1. ▮

If ϵ_0 is sufficiently small, we may assume that the following condition is satisfied:

(C2) We put $0\neq\eta:=\min\bigcup_i\bigl\{|a-b|\,\big|\,a,b\in\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i),a\neq b\bigr\}$. We pick $\eta_1<3^{-1}\eta$. Then for any $u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$ and for any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, the inequality $\bigl|\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)-\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)\bigr|<\eta_1$ holds.

Note the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 15.2 *Let ϵ_0 be a positive number satisfying the condition $(C2)$. For any element $u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$ such that $\mathfrak{k}(\lambda_0,u)\in\mathcal{KMS}({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)$, and for any $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we have the following:*

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)<0\Longrightarrow\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)<0,$$

$$\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)>0\Longrightarrow\mathfrak{p}(\lambda,u)>0.$$

Proof Obvious. ▮

Let ϵ_0 be a positive number satisfying the condition $(C2)$. Then we have the parabolic structure $^{i}F=\bigl({}^{i}F_c^{(\lambda_0)}\,\big|\,b_i-1\leq c\leq b_i\bigr)$ of ${}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$. We shall define the subsheaf $^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ as follows:

1. For $\boldsymbol{c}=(c_i)\in\boldsymbol{R}^l$ such that $c_i\in\mathcal{P}ar\bigl({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr)$, we put as follows:

$$^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}:=\bigl\{f\in{}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}\,\big|\,f_{|\mathcal{D}_i}\in{}^{i}F_{c_i}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 15.3 *We have $^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}={}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\eta_1\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}$. In particular, it is locally free on $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.*

Proof It is clear from our choice of ϵ_0 and η_1. ▮

In particular, we obtain the parabolic filtration $^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition $^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

2. For $\boldsymbol{c} \in \prod_{i=1}^{l}[b_i-1,b_i]$, we put $\boldsymbol{c}'=(c_i')$, $c_i' := \max\bigl\{x \in \mathcal{P}ar({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, i) \bigm| x \leq c_i\bigr\}$, and we put as follows:
$$ {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} := {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}. $$

3. For general $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l}$ we take $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{l}$ such that $\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{n}=\boldsymbol{c}' \in \prod_{i=1}^{l}[b_i-1,b_i]$, and then we put as follows:
$$ {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} := \Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{l} x_i^{-n_i}\Bigr) \cdot {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}. $$

Remark 15.1 *As before, the subsheaf* ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is given independently of choices of* $\boldsymbol{b}$ *and* ϵ_0. ■

Lemma 15.4 *We have the following:*
$$ {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} = {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_1)} $$
Here we put $\boldsymbol{d}=(d_i)$ *and* $d_i = \max\bigl\{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_1,u) \bigm| u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{0},i),\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) \leq c_i\bigr\}$.

Proof It immediately follows from our construction. ■

Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a right $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$-module (see the remark in the first part of this section), $j_*\mathcal{E}$ is a $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$-module. The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 15.5 ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ *is the* $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$*-submodule of* $j_*\mathcal{E}$. *We have the following implication:*
$$ {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \cdot \eth_i \subset {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, \qquad {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \cdot z_i \subset {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}. $$

■

15.1.2 The filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$

We put $\boldsymbol{\delta} := \overbrace{(1,\ldots,1)}^{l}$. For $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{l}$, we put as follows on $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:
$$ {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr) := {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}. $$

For any $I \subset \underline{l}$ and for any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}$, we put as follows:
$$ {}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr) = \bigcup_{q_I(\boldsymbol{b})=\boldsymbol{c}} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr). $$

The following equality is clear:
$$ \bigcap_{i\in I} {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{c_i}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr) = {}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr). $$

Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{l}$ be a decomposition. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^{J}$ respectively. On the vector bundle ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, we have the induced filtrations ${}^{j}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$. The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 15.6 *Let* $\boldsymbol{b}'$ *be an element of* $\boldsymbol{R}^{J}$ *such that* $\boldsymbol{b}' \leq \boldsymbol{b}$. *We have the natural isomorphism:*
$$ {}^{J}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\Bigl({}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\Bigr) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{b}'}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr). $$

Proof It can be reduced to the compatibility of the parabolic filtrations. ■

Let i be an element of I. The actions of z_i and $\eth_i$ induce the morphisms:
$$ \begin{aligned} z_i &: {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr), \\ \eth_i &: {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr), \end{aligned} \tag{306} $$

Lemma 15.7

- *The induces morphism z_i in* (306) *is isomorphic. It is strict with respect to the filtrations ${}^{j}V_j^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$.*
- *The induced morphism $\eth_i$ in* (306) *is strict with respect to the filtrations ${}^{j}V_j^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$.*

Proof The first claim is clear. The second claim can be reduced to the strictness of the residue $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ with respect to the parabolic filtrations ${}^{j}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$. The generalized eigen decompositions of the residues $\mathrm{Res}_j(\mathbb{D})$ $(j \in J)$ gives the splitting of ${}^{j}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$ on the open dense subset of generic points in $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Hence we can show the strictness of $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ with respect to the filtrations ${}^{j}F$ $(j \in J)$ by using Proposition 5.2. ▮

15.1.3 The right action of $z_i\eth_i$

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$, and $J = \underline{l} - I$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^J$ respectively. On $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the sheaf ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big)$.

Lemma 15.8 *We have the natural isomorphism* ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big) \simeq {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_I}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\big({}^{\Box}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}+\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_I}\big)$. *In particular,* ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big)$ *is a vector bundle over* $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Proof It is clear from our construction of the filtration ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}$. ▮

The right actions of $z_i\eth_i$ $(i \in I)$ on ${}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}$ induces the endomorphisms of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big)$. (See Lemma 15.5).

Lemma 15.9 *The endomorphism induced by $z_i \cdot \eth_i$ is same as $-\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) - \lambda$, under the isomorphism in Lemma* 15.8*.*

Proof The right action of $z_i \cdot \eth_i$ corresponds to the left action of $-\eth_i \cdot z_i = -z_i \cdot \eth_i - \lambda$. Then the claim immediately follows. ▮

Lemma 15.10 *The eigen functions of the right action of $z_i\eth_i$ $(i \in I)$ on ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big)$ are as follows:*

$$\big\{-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) \,\big|\, u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i),\ \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) = c_i\big\}.$$

Proof Hence the eigenvalue of the right action of $z_i\eth_i$ is described as $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u) - \lambda$ for $u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) = c_i + 1$. Thus it is described as $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$ for some $u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ such that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) = c_i$. ▮

In the following, we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, i, c) := \big\{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u) = c\big\},$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, I, c) := \big\{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, I) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{c}\big\}.$$

15.1.4 ${}^{I}\tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d})$ and some properties

We put as follows:

$${}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}) := {}^{I}\mathbb{E}\big(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})\big).$$

Then we have the decomposition:

$${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}\big) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, I, \boldsymbol{c})} {}^{I}\mathbb{E}\big(-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, \boldsymbol{u})\big) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, I, \boldsymbol{c})} {}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}).$$

Lemma 15.11 *We have the following induced morphisms for $i \in I$:*

$$z_i : {}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0\,i}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}).$$

$$\eth_i : {}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}}^{(\lambda_0)}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}({}^{\Box}\mathcal{E}).$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}$ denotes the element of $\big(\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}\big)^I$ determined by $q_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}) = (1, 0)$ and $q_j(\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}) = (0, 0)$ $(j \neq i)$.

Proof It follows from the relations $(z_i\cdot\eth_i)\cdot z_i = z_i\cdot\big(z_i\cdot\eth_i\big)+\lambda\cdot z_i$ and $(z_i\cdot\eth_i)\cdot\eth_i=\eth_i\cdot(z_i\cdot\eth_i)-\lambda\cdot\eth_i$. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_i\,|\,i\in I)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. The elements $\boldsymbol{a}=(a_i\,|\,i\in I)\in\boldsymbol{R}^I_{<0}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}=(n_i\,|\,i\in I)\in\mathbb{Z}^I_{\geq 0}$ are taken as follows: If $b_i\geq 0$, the numbers a_i and n_i are determined by the conditions $-1\leq a_i<0$ and $n_i:=b_i-a_i$. If $b_i<0$, we put $a_i:=b_i$ and $n_i:=0$. If $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{b}$, we obtain the morphism:

$$\prod_i\eth_i^{n_i}:{}^I\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}'}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)\longrightarrow{}^I\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big).$$

Here we put $\boldsymbol{u}'=\boldsymbol{u}-\sum_i n_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}$. The image of the morphism is denoted by ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})$. By our construction, we have the surjection, in the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)\geq -1$:

$$\eth_i:{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i},\boldsymbol{d}).$$

The multiplication of z_i induces the morphism ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$.

Lemma 15.12 *The image is contained in* ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i},\boldsymbol{d})$.

Proof We decompose $\boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}'+\sum n_i\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}$ as above. In the case $n_i=0$, the claim is clear. In the case $n_i>0$, the claim follows from the relation $\eth_i^{n_i}z_i=\big(z_i\eth_i+\lambda\cdot n_i\big)\eth_i^{n_i-1}$. ∎

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 15.13 *The morphism* $z_i:{}^I\tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^I\tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i},\boldsymbol{d})$ *is injective. It is isomorphic in the following cases:*

- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)<0$.
- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)=0$ *and* $u_i\neq(0,0)$.
- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)>0$ *and* $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u_i)\neq 0$. ∎

The unique eigenvalue of the right action of $z_i\eth_i$ on ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$, by our construction.

Lemma 15.14 *The morphism* $\eth_i:{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i},\boldsymbol{d})$ *is injective unless* $u_i=(-1,0)$.

Proof Let us consider the following morphisms:

$$ {}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})\xrightarrow{\eth_i}{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i},\boldsymbol{d})\xrightarrow{z_i}{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d}).$$

The composite is the right action of $\eth_i z_i=z_i\eth_i+\lambda$. The eigenfunction of $\eth_i z_i$ on ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})$ is given by $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)+\lambda$. In the case $u_i\neq(-1,0)$, we have $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)+\lambda=-\alpha+(a+1)\lambda+\bar{\alpha}\lambda^2\neq 0$. Hence the composite $\eth_i z_i$ is injective, and thus $\eth_i$ is injective. ∎

The following lemma can be shown similarly.

Lemma 15.15 *The induced morphism* $\eth_i$ *is isomorphic in the following cases:*

- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)>-1$.
- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)=-1$ *and* $u_i\neq(-1,0)$.
- $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)<-1$ *and* $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u)+\lambda\neq 0$. ∎

Lemma 15.16 *The sheaf* ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{d})$ *is a locally free* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$*-module.*

Proof We may assume $I = \underline{k}$ for some $k \leq l$. We put $J := \underline{l} - \underline{k}$. Due to Lemma 15.14, we may assume that $u_i = (0,0)$ $(i \leq m)$ and $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_i) < 0$ $(m < i \leq k)$ for some $m \leq k$. We put $\boldsymbol{u}' := \boldsymbol{u} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}$. Then ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{d})$ is the image of the morphism:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m} \eth_i : {}^{\underline{k}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}'}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{k}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr). \tag{307}$$

On ${}^{\underline{k}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, we have the nilpotent endomorphisms $\mathcal{N}_i := \mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda$ $(i \in \underline{m})$. It is clear that the image of the morphism (307) is same as the image of $\prod_{i=1}^{m} \mathcal{N}_i$. Then it is locally free due to the limiting mixed twistor theorem. (See Lemma 12.34). ▮

For $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{l}-I}$, we put as follows:

$${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d}) := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, I, \boldsymbol{b})} {}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{d}).$$

Corollary 15.2 *The sheaf* ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d})$ *is a locally free* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)}$*-module. The surjective morphism* $\eth_i$: ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d}) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \boldsymbol{d})$ *is isomorphic in the case* $b_i > -1$.

In the case $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}_{<0}$, *we have* ${}^{I}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d}) \simeq {}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\;{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. ▮

15.1.5 A lemma

Let k and m be integers such that $1 \leq m \leq k \leq l$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{k}$ such that $c_i = 0$ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, $c_m = -1$ and $c_i < 0$ $(m < i \leq k)$. We put $J := \underline{l} - \underline{k}$, and let $\boldsymbol{d}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{J}$. For any subset $K \subset \underline{k}$, we put $K' := \underline{l} - K$. We have the projection:

$$\pi_K : {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{K}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{q_K(\boldsymbol{c})}\;{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{q_{K'}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d})}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Lemma 15.34.

Lemma 15.17 *Let s be a section of the following locally free sheaf on* $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$*:*

$$\mathrm{Ker}\Bigl({}^{\underline{k}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d}) \xrightarrow{\eth_m} {}^{\underline{k}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_m, \boldsymbol{d})\Bigr). \tag{308}$$

Then we can take a section $g \in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$ *satisfying the following:*

- $\pi_{\underline{k}}(g) = s \in {}^{\underline{k}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d}) \subset {}^{\underline{k}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\;{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.
- *For any subset* $K \subset \underline{k}$, *we have the following:*

$$\pi_K(g_{|\mathcal{D}_K}) \in \begin{cases} \mathrm{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D})\bigr) \cap \mathrm{Im}\Bigl(\prod_{i \in K, i \leq m-1} (\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda)\Bigr), & (m \in K), \\ \mathrm{Im}\Bigl(\prod_{i \in K, i \leq m-1} (\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda)\Bigr), & (m \notin K). \end{cases} \tag{309}$$

Here the right hand side of (309) *denote the subbundles of* ${}^{K}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{q_K(\boldsymbol{c})}\;{}^{K'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{q_{K'}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d})}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

Proof Before entering the proof, we give a few remarks.

1. The subbundle (308) of ${}^{\underline{k}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\;{}^{J}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$ is same as $\mathrm{Ker}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D})\bigr) \cap \mathrm{Im}\bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda)\bigr)$.
2. By tensoring the model bundle of rank 1, we can reduce the problem to the case $c_i = 0$ $(i < m)$, $= -1$ $(m \leq i \leq k)$. Hence we consider only the case in the following.

For the proof of Lemma 15.17, we need some preparation. Let us take a frame $\boldsymbol{v}$ of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. Since we have ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)=\,{}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{l}}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ by definition, we have the following:

$$0<{}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\leq 1,\qquad (1\leq j<m),$$

$$-1<{}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\leq 0,\quad (m\leq j\leq k).$$

Let us take positive integer b_j $(j\in\underline{k})$. Then we obtain the integers $n_j(v_i)$ determined as follows:

$$0<-n_j(v_i)+b_j\cdot{}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\leq 1,\qquad (1\leq j<m)$$

$$-1<-n_j(v_i)+b_j\cdot{}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\leq 0,\quad (m\leq j\leq k).$$

Note the following:

$$0\leq n_j(v_i)\leq b_j-1,\qquad (1\leq j<m),$$

$$-b_j+1\leq n_j(v_i)\leq 0,\quad (m\leq j\leq k).$$

If b_j is sufficiently large, we have $n_j(v_i)\neq n_j(v_p)$ in the case ${}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)\neq{}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_p)$.

Let us consider the morphism $\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}:X\longrightarrow X$ given by the correspondence:

$$(z_1,\ldots,z_n)\longmapsto(z_1^{b_1},\ldots,z_k^{b_k},z_{k+1},\ldots,z_n).$$

We put $\tilde{v}_i:=\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}(v_i)\cdot\prod_j z_j^{n_j(v_i)}$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}:=(\tilde{v}_i)$. Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ gives the frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Recall that we have the natural $\prod_{i=1}^{k}\mu_{b_i}$-action on X (see the subsection 2.3 for the notation). Let ω_i be the generator of μ_{b_i}, and then the action is given by $\omega_i\cdot\bigl(z_1,\ldots,z_n\bigr)=\bigl(z_1,\ldots,z_{i-1},\omega_i\cdot z_i,z_{i+1},\ldots,z_n\bigr)$. The action is naturally lifted to the action on ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

On the divisor $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, we have the decomposition:

$${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}=\bigoplus_{a\in S(i)}{}^{i}U_a.$$

Here ω_i acts as ω_i^a on ${}^{i}U_a$, and we put as follows:

$$S(i):=\begin{cases}\bigl\{a\in\mathbb{Z}\,\big|\,0\leq a\leq b_i-1\bigr\}, & (1\leq i<m),\\[2ex] \bigl\{a\in\mathbb{Z}\,\big|\,-b_i+1\leq a\leq 0\bigr\}, & (m\leq i\leq k).\end{cases}$$

The tuple of the decompositions $\bigl({}^{i}U\,\big|\,i\in\underline{k}\bigr)$ is compatible.

We put as follows:

$$n_i:=\begin{cases}b_i-1, & (1\leq i<m),\\[2ex] 0 & (m\leq i\leq k).\end{cases}$$

We obtain the element $\boldsymbol{n}_K:=\bigl(n_i\,\big|\,i\in K\bigr)\in\mathbb{Z}^K$. We have the vector bundle ${}^{K}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_K}:=\bigcap_{k\in K}{}^{k}U_{n_k\,|\,\mathcal{D}_K}$. Then the frames $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ induces the isomorphism:

$${}^{K}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_K}\simeq{}^{K}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{q_K(\boldsymbol{c})}\,{}^{K'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{q_{K'}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d})}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr).\tag{310}$$

On the right hand side of (310), we have the nilpotent endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})+\lambda$ $(i\in K,i<m)$. On the left hand side, the corresponding morphism F_i is given by $b_i^{-1}\cdot\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_i(\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{*}\mathbb{D})+\lambda\bigr)$. In the case $m\in K$, we also have the nilpotent endomorphism $\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D})$ on the right hand side of (310). The corresponding morphism F_m is given by $b_m^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{Res}_m(\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{*}\mathbb{D})$.

In particular, we have the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{k}}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_{\underline{k}}} \simeq {}^{\underline{k}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$. Let $\tilde{s}$ denote the section of ${}^{\underline{k}}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_{\underline{k}}}$ corresponding to s.

Then $\tilde{s}$ is contained in the following:

$$\mathrm{Ker}\big(F_{m\,|\,\mathcal{D}_{\underline{k}}}\big) \cap \mathrm{Im}\Big(\prod_{i\leq m-1} F_{i\,|\,\mathcal{D}_{\underline{k}}}\Big).$$

Lemma 15.18 *We can take an equivariant section* $\tilde{g} \in {}^{\underline{l}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^{\square}\psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\big)$ *such that* $\tilde{g}_{|\mathcal{D}_{\underline{k}}} = \tilde{s}$ *and that the following holds:*

$$\tilde{g}_{|\mathcal{D}_K} \in \begin{cases} \mathrm{Ker}(F_m) \cap \mathrm{Im}\Big(\prod_{i\leq m-1, i\in K} F_i\Big) \cap {}^{K}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_K} & (m \in K) \\ \\ \mathrm{Im}\Big(\prod_{i\leq m-1, i\in J} F_i\Big) \cap {}^{K}U_{\boldsymbol{n}_K} & (m \notin K). \end{cases}$$

Here we put $\boldsymbol{n}_K := \big(n_k \,\big|\, k \in K\big)$.

Proof It follows from Lemma 2.8. ▮

We put $g_1 := \tilde{g} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n_i} z_i^{-n_i}$, which may be assumed invariant under the action of $\mu_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. Then we have the section g of ${}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$, such that $g_1 = \psi_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{-1}g$. Due to the isomorphism (310), it can be checked that the section g has the desired properties. Thus the proof of Lemma 15.17 is accomplished. ▮

15.2 Prolongment $\mathfrak{E}$

15.2.1 Preliminary for the construction of $\mathfrak{E}$

Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. We have the vector bundle ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ over $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ $(i = 1,\ldots,l)$. We often denote $\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ by $\mathcal{D}_i$ for simplicity of notation. We have the action of the residue $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ on ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. Note that the right action of $-z_m \cdot \eth_m$ induces the endomorphism $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda$ on ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$.

We put as follows (see the subsubsection 2.6.2 for $\mathbb{E}_\eta$):

$${}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \beta\big) := \mathbb{E}_\eta(\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}), \beta).$$

Then we have the decomposition:

$${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} = \bigoplus_{\beta\in\mathcal{S}p({}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, i)} {}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{D}_i}, \beta\big).$$

Let us consider the case $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{\delta} = (\overbrace{1,\ldots,1}^{l})$. We have the decomposition ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} = {}^{i}\mathbb{E}_0^{(\lambda_0)} \oplus {}^{i}\mathbb{E}_1^{(\lambda_0)}$. Here we put as follows:

$${}^{i}\mathbb{E}_0^{(\lambda_0)} = {}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, -\lambda_0\big), \qquad {}^{i}\mathbb{E}_1^{(\lambda_0)} = \bigoplus_{\beta\neq-\lambda_0} {}^{i}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{D}_i(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}, \beta\big).$$

On ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}_1^{(\lambda_0)}$, the morphism $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda$ is invertible. We denote the inverse by $(\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda)^{-1}$. We have the filtration ${}^{i}F^{(\lambda_0)}$ on ${}^{i}\mathbb{E}_j^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j = 0, 1)$. We have the following naturally defined projections:

$$\pi_i : {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} \longrightarrow {}^{i}\,\mathrm{Gr}_1^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^{i}\mathbb{E}_0^{(\lambda_0)}, \qquad \pi'_i : {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}{}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} \longrightarrow {}^{i}\mathbb{E}_1^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}_0 := \big\{f \in {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, \pi_i(f_{|\mathcal{D}_i}) = 0 \ \ (i \leq l)\big\}.$$

We put as follows, for any integer $m \geq 1$:

$$\mathcal{K}_m := \big\{f \in \mathcal{K}_0 \,\big|\, \pi'_i(f_{|\mathcal{D}_i}) = 0 \ (i \leq m)\big\}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_j)$ be a frame of ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$. For each v_j, we put as follows:

$$S_0(v_j) := \bigl\{ i \bigm| {}^i\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)},\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j) = (1, -\lambda_0) \bigr\},$$

$$S_m(v_j) := S_0(v_j) \sqcup \bigl\{ i \bigm| i \leq m,\ {}^i\deg^{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_j) \neq -\lambda_0 \bigr\}.$$

We put as follows:

$$\tilde{v}_{m,j} := v_j \cdot \prod_{i \in S_m(v_j)} z_i, \qquad \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_m = \bigl(\tilde{v}_{m,j}\bigr).$$

Lemma 15.19 *$\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_m$ is a frame of $\mathcal{K}_m$. In particular, $\mathcal{K}_m$ is locally free.*

Proof It immediately follows from the definition of $\mathcal{K}_m$. ∎

We have $\mathcal{K}_0 \supset \mathcal{K}_1 \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{K}_l$. We also have $\mathcal{K}_l \subset {}^{\square}_{(1-\epsilon)\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Lemma 15.20 *For any section $f \in \mathcal{K}_{m-1}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{K}_m$ such that $f - g\eth_m \in \mathcal{K}_m$.*

Proof We can regard f as a section of ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}$. The restriction $f_{|\mathcal{D}_m} \in {}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{D}_m}$ is decomposed as $f_{|\mathcal{D}_m} = f_0 + f_1$, where $f_j \in {}^m\mathbb{E}_j^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j = 0, 1)$ such that $\pi_m(f_0) = 0$ in $\mathrm{Gr}_1^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigl({}^m\mathbb{E}_0\bigr)$.

For any $i < m$, the restriction $f_{1\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}$ is contained in ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{0\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m} \cap {}^m\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{1\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}$, and we have $\pi_i(f_{1\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}) = 0$ in ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_1^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}^i\mathbb{E}_0)_{|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}$.

We put $g_1 := \bigl(\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda\bigr)^{-1} f_1 \in {}^m\mathbb{E}_1$. Then for any $i < m$, we have $g_{1\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m} \in {}^i\mathbb{E}_{0\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m} \cap {}^m\mathbb{E}_{1|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}$ and $\pi_i(g_{1\,|\,\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}) = 0$ in ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}({}^i\mathbb{E}_0)_{|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_m}$.

We can pick $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{K}_{m-1}$ such that $\tilde{g}_{|\mathcal{D}_m} = g_1$. We put $g := -\tilde{g} \cdot z_m \in \mathcal{K}_{m-1}(-\mathcal{D}_m) \subset \mathcal{K}_m$. Then we have $f - g \cdot \eth_m \in \mathcal{K}_{m-1}$, and we have the following:

$$(f - g \cdot \eth_m)_{|\mathcal{D}_m} = f_{|\mathcal{D}_m} - \bigl(\tilde{g} \cdot (-z_m \cdot \eth_m)\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_m} = f_0 + f_1 - (\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda) \cdot g_1 = f_0.$$

Hence $f - \eth_m g \in \mathcal{K}_m$. ∎

Corollary 15.3 *For any section $f \in \mathcal{K}_0$, there exist sections $g_1, \ldots, g_l \in \mathcal{K}_l$ and $f_0 \in \mathcal{K}_l$ such that the following holds:*

$$f = \sum_{m=1}^{l} g_m \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} \eth_j + f_0.$$

Proof We have only to use Lemma 15.20 inductively. ∎

15.2.2 The definition of the prolongment $\mathfrak{E}$

Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be as in $(C2)$. The subsheaf $\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is obtained, which we will explain in the following. We put as follows, for any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l_{<0}$:

$${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)} := {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}{}^{\square}\mathcal{E}.$$

Then we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)} := \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l_{<0}} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

The sheaf $\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is the $\mathcal{R}$-submodule of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ generated by ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Lemma 15.21 *For $\lambda_1 \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the following:*

$$\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)} = \mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)}.$$

Proof Due to the condition $(C2)$ on ϵ_0 and Lemma 15.2, we obtain ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \subset {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_1)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)}$. It implies the implication $\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \subset \mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)}$.

Let us see ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_1)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)} \subset \mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}$. Due to the condition $(C2)$ on ϵ_0, we have ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_1)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)} \subset \mathcal{K}_{0\,|\,\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}$. Hence any sections $f \in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_1)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_1)}$ is described as follows, due to Corollary 15.3:

$$f = f_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{l} g_m \cdot \prod_{j=m}^{l} \eth_j, \qquad \bigl(f_0, g_m \in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}\bigr).$$

Thus we obtain $f \in \mathfrak{E}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}$. ■

Corollary 15.4 *We obtain the global $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$-module $\mathfrak{E}$. It is strict.* ■

15.2.3 The filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\mathfrak{E}$

For $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$, we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E} := \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{c}<0,\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\\ \boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{n}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathfrak{E}\cdot\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

For any subset $I \subset \underline{l}$, we put as follows:

$${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathfrak{E} := \bigcup_{q_I(\boldsymbol{b})=\boldsymbol{a}} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E}.$$

In particular, ${}^{\{i\}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathfrak{E}$ is denoted by ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\mathfrak{E}$.

15.2.4 Remark

Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X-\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}D_i$. Let $(E',\overline{\partial}_{E'},h',\theta')$ be the restriction $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta)$ to $X-\bigcup_{i=1}^{n}D_i$. Then we obtain the two $\mathcal{R}$-modules $\mathfrak{E}(E)$ and $\mathfrak{E}(E')$ on $\mathcal{X}$. They can be regarded as the subsheaf of $i_*\mathcal{E}'$, where i denote the inclusion $X-\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}D_i \subset X$. It is easy to see that we have ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}(E) = {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}(E')$ for any λ_0, which implies $\mathfrak{E}(E)=\mathfrak{E}(E')$. Hence we may assume $l=n$, if we need it.

15.2.5 ${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$ and the easy properties

Let us pick a decomposition $I \sqcup J = \underline{l}$. For any elements $\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$, we put as follows:

$${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) := \frac{{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\mathfrak{E}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S}{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E}},$$

Here we put $S := \{\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l \mid q_I(\boldsymbol{b}) \lneq \boldsymbol{c}, q_J(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq \boldsymbol{d}\}$.

Lemma 15.22 *Let $\boldsymbol{b}=(b_1,\ldots,b_l)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$. If we have $b_i+1\geq 0$ for some $i\in\underline{l}$, then we have ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}(\mathfrak{E}) = {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})\cdot\eth_i + {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}(\mathfrak{E})$. Here we put $\boldsymbol{b}' := (b_1,\ldots,b_{i-1},-\epsilon,b_{i+1},\ldots,b_l)$ for some positive number ϵ.*

Proof The implication $\supset$ is clear. We show the implication $\subset$. Let f be an element of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathfrak{E}$ such that $\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{n}\leq\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I_{<0}$. In the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{n})\geq 1$, we have $f\cdot\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\in{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}$, which implies $f\cdot\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\eth_i$. In the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{n})=0$, we have the following:

$$q_j(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{n})\leq q_j(\boldsymbol{b}),\ (j\neq i),\quad q_i(\boldsymbol{c})<0.$$

Thus $f\cdot\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}$. Therefore we are done. ■

Corollary 15.5 *Let* $\boldsymbol{c}$ *be an element of* $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ *such that* $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})+1\geq 0$ *for some* $i\in I$. *Let* $\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$. *Then the induced morphism* $\eth_i : {}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow {}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d})$ *is surjective.* ▮

Since we have the inclusion ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})\longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$ for any $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l$, we have the naturally defined morphism $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}} : {}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

Lemma 15.23 $\mathrm{Im}(f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}})={}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$.

Proof In the case $\boldsymbol{c}<0$, the claim immediately follows from the definition of ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}$ and ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}$, namely, both of them are same as ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
{}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[r, "f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}"] \arrow[d, "\eth_i"'] & {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E}) \arrow[d, "\eth_i"'] \\
{}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[r, "f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}}"] & {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E}).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{311}$$

If $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})+1\geq 0$, the left $\eth_i$ in the diagramm (311) is surjective, due to Corollary 15.5. As for the right $\eth_i$, we have $\eth_i({}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}))={}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d})$. Then it is easy to show the following implication:

$$\mathrm{Im}\, f_{(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})}={}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) \implies \mathrm{Im}(f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}})={}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}).$$

Hence the general case can be reduced to the case $\boldsymbol{c}<0$. ▮

Remark 15.2 *Later we see that* $f_{(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})}$ *is isomorphic (Lemma* 15.33*).* ▮

15.3 Comparison of ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$ and ${}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$

15.3.1 Preliminary

For any subset $I\subset\underline{l}$, let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_I\in\boldsymbol{R}^l$ denote the element determined by the conditions $q_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_I)=1$ $(i\in I)$ and $q_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_I)=0$ $(i\not\in I)$. In particular, we put $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{m}}:=(\overbrace{1,\ldots,1}^{m},0,\ldots,0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_m:=(\overbrace{0,\ldots,0}^{m-1},1,0,\ldots,0)$.

Let m be an integer such that $1\leq m\leq l$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^l_{\leq 0}$ such that $b_i=0$ for $i\leq m$. For any subset $J\subset\underline{l}$, we denote $q_J(\boldsymbol{b})$ by $\boldsymbol{b}_J$.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$. We put $J:=\underline{l}-I$. We have the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})_{|\mathcal{D}_I}+\lambda$ $(i\in I)$ of ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_0\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. We put as follows, for $I\subset\underline{l}$ and $m\leq l$:

$${}^IQ_m\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr):=\mathrm{Im}\Bigl(\prod_{\substack{i\in I,\\ i\leq m}}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})+\lambda\bigr)\Bigr)\subset {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_0\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

We often omit to use the notation ${}^IQ_m$ instead of ${}^IQ_m\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr)$, if there are no confusion. We have the generalized eigen decomposition for the tuple of the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D})=\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})\,\big|\,i\in I\bigr)$:

$${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_0\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\boldsymbol{C}^I}{}^I\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D}),\boldsymbol{\beta}\bigr). \tag{312}$$

Let $\mathcal{N}_{i\,\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ denote the nilpotent part of the restriction $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ to ${}^I\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_I(\mathbb{D}),\boldsymbol{\beta}\bigr)$. The decomposition (312) induces the decomposition:

$${}^IQ_m=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\boldsymbol{C}^I}{}^IQ_{m,\boldsymbol{\beta}},\qquad {}^IQ_{m,\boldsymbol{\beta}}=\mathrm{Im}\Bigl(\prod_{\substack{i\in I,\,i\leq m\\ \beta_i=-\lambda_0}}\mathcal{N}_{i,\boldsymbol{\beta}}\Bigr).$$

Lemma 15.24 *${}^{I}Q_m\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr)$ is a vector subbundle of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.*

Proof The conjugacy classes of the nilpotent maps $\prod_{i\in I, i\leq m\, \beta_i=-\lambda_0}\mathcal{N}_{i,\boldsymbol{\beta}\,|\,(\lambda,P)}$ is independent of (λ, P), which follows from a limiting mixed twistor theorem. (See Lemma 12.34). Then the lemma follows. ▮

Let m be an integer such that $0\leq m\leq l$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^{l}_{\leq 0}$ such that $b_i=0$ for $i\leq m$. For any subset $I\subset \underline{m}$, we put $J:=\underline{l}-I$. We have the projection $\tilde{\pi}_I : {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\longrightarrow {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

Then we put as follows, for $\boldsymbol{d}=\sum_{i=m+1}^{l}d_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$ $(-1\leq d_i<0)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{m,\boldsymbol{d}}:=\bigl\{f\in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\;\big|\;\tilde{\pi}_I(f)\in {}^{I}Q_m,\ \forall I\subset\underline{m}\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 15.25 *For $m\geq 1$, we have the following equality for some positive number ϵ:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{m,\boldsymbol{d}}=\mathcal{L}_{m-1,\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}\cdot\eth_m+\mathcal{L}_{m-1,\boldsymbol{d}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}\tag{313}$$

Proof Let us see the implication $\supset$. Clearly we have $\mathcal{L}_{m-1,\boldsymbol{d}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}\subset\mathcal{L}_{m,\boldsymbol{d}}$. Let f be a section of $\mathcal{L}_{m-1,\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}$. Since $\mathcal{L}_{m-1,\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}$ is contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, we have $f\cdot\eth_m\in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. For any subset $I\subset\underline{m}$ such that $m\notin I$, we have the following:

$$\tilde{\pi}_I(f)\in {}^{I}Q_{m-1}\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr),\qquad \tilde{\pi}_I\Bigl((f\cdot\eth_m)\Bigr)\in {}^{I}Q_{m-1}\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr)={}^{I}Q_{m}\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr).$$

We put $\tilde{f}:=f\cdot z_m^{-1}$, and then we have $(f\cdot\eth_m)_{|\mathcal{D}_m}=-\bigl(\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D})+\lambda\bigr)\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_m}$. For a subset $I\subset\underline{l}$ such that $m\notin I$, we put $I'=I\sqcup\{m\}$. Note we have the following:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{I'}(\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_{I'}})\in {}^{I'}Q_{m-1}\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr).$$

Thus we obtain $\tilde{\pi}_{I'}\bigl((f\cdot\eth_m)_{|\mathcal{D}_{I'}}\bigr)\in {}^{I'}Q_m\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\bigr)$. Thus we obtain the implication $\supset$ in (313).

Let us show the implication $\subset$ in (313). It will be accomplished after Lemma 15.32. For $\boldsymbol{c}=(c_1,\ldots,c_m)\in\mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$, we have the morphism $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}:X\longrightarrow X$ given by $(z_1,\ldots,z_n)\longmapsto(z_1^{c_1},\ldots,z_m^{c_m},z_{m+1},\ldots,z_n)$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a holomorphic frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Since we have ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)=\underset{\boldsymbol{d}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{l}}}{\square}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$, we have the positivity $0<b_j(v_i):={}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)$ for $j\in\underline{m}$. We have the integers $N_j(v_i)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for any $j\in\underline{m}$, determined as follows:

$$0<c_j\cdot b_j(v_i)-N_j(v_i)\leq 1.$$

If c_j is sufficiently large, we have $N_j(v_i)\neq N_j(v_k)$ in the case $b_j(v_i)\neq b_j(v_k)$.

Lemma 15.26 *If ${}^{j}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i)=1$, we have $N_j(v_i)=c_j-1$.*

Proof Note $0<c_j\cdot 1-(c_j-1)=1\leq 1$. ▮

Let us pick $\epsilon_0>0$ satisfying $(C2)$ for $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}$ (the subsubsection 15.1.1). We put as follows:

$$\tilde{v}_i:=\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}(v_i)\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{m}z_j^{N_j(v_i)},\qquad \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}=(\tilde{v}_i).$$

Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is a holomorphic frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$.

We have the $\mu_{\boldsymbol{c}}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\mu_{c_i}$-action on X as usual. The action is lifted to the action on ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. For $j\in\underline{m}$, we have the weight decomposition:

$${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^{\square}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{E}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{D}_j}=\bigoplus_{a=0}^{c_j-1}{}^{j}U_a.$$

Here the action of μ_{c_j} on ${}^{j}U_a$ is of weight a. If c_j is sufficiently large, we have the map $\varphi_j : \{a \,|\, {}^{j}U_a \neq 0\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}ar\big({}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{L}}+\boldsymbol{d}}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_0)}, j\big)$, and the decomposition gives the splitting of the filtration ${}^{j}F^{(\lambda_0)}$:

$$ {}^{j}F_b^{(\lambda_0)} = \bigoplus_{\varphi_j(a)\leq b} {}^{j}U_a. $$

(See the subsubsection 8.6.2 for such a splitting.)

We put $N_i = c_i - 1$ $(i \in I)$, and we put $\boldsymbol{N}_{\boldsymbol{I}} := (N_i \,|\, i \in I) \in \mathbb{Z}^{I}$. Then the frames $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ induce the isomorphism, for $I \subset \underline{m}$:

$$ {}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I} = \bigcap_{i\in I} {}^{i}U_{N_i} \simeq {}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big). \tag{314} $$

We have the endomorphisms $\mathrm{Res}_i\big(\mathbb{D}\big) + \lambda$ on the right hand side of (314). On the other hand, we have the endomorphism $c_i^{-1} \cdot \big(\mathrm{Res}(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathbb{D} + \lambda)\big)$ on the left hand side.

Lemma 15.27 *Under the isomorphism* (314)*, the endomorphism* $c_i^{-1} \cdot \big(\mathrm{Res}(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathbb{D}+\lambda)\big)$ *corresponds to* $\mathrm{Res}_i\big(\mathbb{D}\big) + \lambda$.

Proof If $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \sum_i \mathcal{A}_i \cdot dz_i/z_i$, then we have the following:

$$ \big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}\big)\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \cdot \Big(\sum_i \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{A}_i \cdot c_i \cdot \frac{dz_i}{z_i} + \sum \mathcal{N}_i \cdot \lambda \frac{dz_i}{z_i}\Big). $$

Here $\mathcal{N}_i$ denote the diagonal matrices such that $(\mathcal{N}_i)_{j\,j} = N_i(v_j)$, and we put $c_i = 1$ for $i \geq m+1$, for simplicity.

We put $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_I := \big(\tilde{v}_i \,|\, {}^{I}\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) = \boldsymbol{\delta}_I\big)$. Then we have the following:

$$ \mathrm{Res}_i(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D})\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_I = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_I \cdot \Big(c_i \cdot \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{A}_{i|{}^{i}U_{N_i}} + (c_i - 1)\cdot\lambda\Big). $$

Hence we obtain the following:

$$ \Big(\mathrm{Res}_i(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}) + \lambda\Big)\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_I = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_I \cdot c_i \cdot \Big(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathcal{A}_{|{}^{i}U_{N_i}} + \lambda\Big). $$

Thus we are done. ∎

Let us consider a section f of $\mathcal{L}_{m,\boldsymbol{d}}$ and consider the pull back $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}f$. Recall we put $N_j = c_j - 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. We put as follows:

$$ \tilde{f} := \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}f \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} z_j^{N_j}. $$

Then we obtain the section $\tilde{f} \in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}\big)$.

Lemma 15.28

- *We have* $\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} \in {}^{i}F_{d_i}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *for any* $i > m$.
- *We have* $\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_i} \in {}^{i}U_{N_i}$ *for any* $i \leq m$.

Proof The first claim is clear. Note that our $\boldsymbol{c}$ is an element of $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{m}$.

We have the description $f = \sum f_j \cdot v_j$, and then we have the following:

$$ \tilde{f} = \sum \phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}(f_j) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m} z_i^{N_i - N_i(v_j)} \cdot \tilde{v}_j. \tag{315} $$

The second claim immediately follows from (315). ∎

We take the subbundles ${}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m$ of ${}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I}$ for $I \subset \underline{m}$:

$${}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m := \mathrm{Im}\Big(\prod_{i \in I} \big(\mathrm{Res}_i(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}) + \lambda\big)\Big) \cap {}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I}.$$

We also take the vector subbundles ${}^{I}\tilde{R}_m$ of ${}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I}$ for any subset $I \subset \underline{m}$ such that $m \in I$:

$${}^{I}\tilde{R}_m := \mathrm{Im}\Big(\prod_{i \in I, i < m} \big(\mathrm{Res}_i(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}) + \lambda\big)\Big) \cap {}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I}.$$

In the case $m \in I$, we have the equivariant inclusion ${}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m \subset {}^{I}\tilde{R}_m$ and the naturally defined equivariant surjection:

$$\mathrm{Res}_m(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}) + \lambda : {}^{I}\tilde{R}_m \longrightarrow {}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m. \tag{316}$$

We have $\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_I} \in {}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m$ for any subset $I \subset \underline{m}$, for we have ${}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m \simeq {}^{I}Q_m$ under the isomorphism ${}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I} \simeq {}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$ given in (314).

Lemma 15.29 *For any subset I such that $m \in I$, we can pick the equivariant section $g_I \in {}^{I}\tilde{R}_m$, satisfying the following conditions:*

$$c_m^{-1} \cdot \big(\mathrm{Res}_m(\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1}\mathbb{D}) + \lambda\big) \cdot g_I = \tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_I}, \qquad g_{I\,|\,\mathcal{D}_{I'}} = g_{I'},\ (I \subset I').$$

Proof In the case $I = \underline{m}$, we have the surjection ${}^{\underline{m}}\tilde{R}_m \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{m}}\tilde{Q}_m$, thus we have only to take an appropriate lift.

Assume that we have already picked $g_{I'}$ for any subsets $I \subsetneq I'$, and we will construct g_I. We would like to take a lift of $\tilde{f}_{|\mathcal{D}_I}$ for the morphism (316). The data $(g_{I'}\,|\,I' \supsetneq I)$ gives an equivariant lift of $\tilde{f}_{|\partial\mathcal{D}_I}$, where we put $\partial\mathcal{D}_I := \big(\bigcup_{I \subsetneq I'} \mathcal{D}_{I'}\big)$. We have only to extend it equivariantly. ∎

Lemma 15.30 *We may take an equivariant section $\tilde{g} \in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{*}\mathcal{E}\big)$, satisfying the following:*

- *$\tilde{g}_{|\mathcal{D}_I} \in {}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I}$ for $I \subset \underline{m}$.*
- *$\tilde{g}_{|\mathcal{D}_I} = g_I$ for $I \subset \underline{m}$ such that $m \in I$.*
- *$\tilde{g}$ satisfies the same transformation rule as $\tilde{f}$.*

Proof Note the following: If $m \notin I \subset \underline{m}$, then we have $g_{I \sqcup \{m\}} \in {}^{I}U_{\boldsymbol{N}_I\,|\,\mathcal{D}_{I \sqcup \{m\}}}$. Then the lemma can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4.1 ∎

Note that $\tilde{g} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} z^{-N_j}$ is equivariant and satisfying the same transformation as $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1} f$. Thus we have some section $g' \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\phi_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{-1} g' = \tilde{g} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} z_j^{-N_j}$. We put $g = -z_m \cdot g'$.

Lemma 15.31 $g \in \mathcal{L}_{m-1, \boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_m}$.

Proof For $i > m$, we have ${}^{i}\deg(g) \leq d_i$, which is clear from our construction.

Since we have ${}^{m}\deg(g') \leq 1$, we have ${}^{m}\deg(g) \leq 0$. For $I \subset \underline{m-1}$, we have the following, under the isomorphism given in (314):

$${}^{I}Q_{m-1}\big({}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\big) = {}^{I}Q_m\big({}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\big) \simeq {}^{I}\tilde{Q}_m.$$

Hence we have $\tilde{\pi}_I(g) = -\tilde{\pi}_I(g' \cdot z_m) \in {}^{I}Q_{m-1}\big({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\big)$. Thus we obtain the result. ∎

Lemma 15.32 *We have $f - g \cdot \eth_m \in \mathcal{L}_{m-1, \boldsymbol{d} - \epsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_m}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof We have the following:

$$(g\cdot \eth_m)_{|\mathcal{D}_m}=\big(g'\cdot(-z_m\cdot\eth_m)\big)_{|\mathcal{D}_m}=(\mathrm{Res}_m(\mathbb{D})+\lambda)g'_{|\mathcal{D}_m}.$$

Thus we have $\tilde{\pi}_I\big((g\cdot\eth_m-f)_{|\mathcal{D}_I}\big)=0$ for $I\subset\underline{m}$ such that $m\in I$, by our construction. In the case $m\notin I$, since $\eth_m$ preserves ${}^IQ_{m-1}$, it is easy to see that $\tilde{\pi}_I(f-g\cdot\eth_m)\in Q_{m-1}$. Thus we are done. ∎

The implication $\subset$ in the claim of Lemma 15.25 immediately follows from Lemma 15.31 and Lemma 15.32. Thus the proof of Lemma 15.25 is accomplished. ∎

Corollary 15.6 *We have the following, for some positive number ϵ:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{m,\boldsymbol{d}}=\sum_{I\subset\underline{m}}\mathcal{L}_{0,\boldsymbol{d}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_I-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{m}-I}}\cdot\Big(\prod_{i\in I}\eth_i\Big).$$

Proof We have only to use Lemma 15.25 inductively. ∎

15.3.2 The injectivity of $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$

Recall that $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ is surjective (Lemma 15.23).

Lemma 15.33 *The morphism $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ is injective. As a result it gives the isomorphism:*

$${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})\xrightarrow{\sim}{}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}).$$

Proof First we note that $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ for $\boldsymbol{c}<0$ is isomorphic by definition.

We have the following commutative diagramm due to Lemma 15.23:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
{}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[r, "f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}"] \arrow[d, "\eth_i"'] & {}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[d, "\eth_i"'] \\
{}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[r, "f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}}"] & {}^I\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{317}$$

Let us assume $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})+1>0$. Then the right $\eth_i$ in the diagramm (317) is isomorphic, (Corollary 15.2), and the left $\eth_i$ is surjective (Corollary 15.5). Moreover, we have already known $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}}$ are surjective, due to Lemma 15.23. Hence, under the assumption $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})+1>0$, if $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ is isomorphic, then $f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_i,\boldsymbol{d}}$ and the left $\eth_i$ in the diagramm (317) is isomorphic.

Thus we have only to show the injectivity of $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ in the case $c_j\leq 0$ for any j. For such $\boldsymbol{c}$, we put $m(\boldsymbol{c}):=\#\{i\,|\,c_i=0\}$, and we use an induction on $m(\boldsymbol{c})$.

If $m(\boldsymbol{c})=0$, then we obtain $\boldsymbol{c}<0$, and thus $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ is isomorphic. Assume that we have already known the injectivity of $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ for $m(\boldsymbol{c})\leq m-1$, and then we may derive the injectivity of $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ for $m(\boldsymbol{c})=m$.

We may assume that $I=\underline{k}$. We put $J:=\underline{l}-I$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^k_{\leq 0}$ such that $c_i=0$ $(i\leq m-1)$, $c_m=-1$, and $c_i<0$ $(m<i\leq k)$. Let $\boldsymbol{d}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J$. Due to the hypothesis of the induction, $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ is isomorphic. Once we prove that $f_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,\boldsymbol{d}}$ is isomorphic, then the induction can proceed.

Hence Lemma 15.33 is reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 15.34 *Under the isomorphism $f_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$, we have the following:*

$$\mathrm{Ker}\Big(-\eth_m:{}^{\underline{k}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{k}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,\boldsymbol{d})\Big)=\mathrm{Ker}\Big(-\eth_m:{}^{\underline{k}}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{k}}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,\boldsymbol{d})\Big). \tag{318}$$

Proof The implication $\supset$ is clear from the commutative diagramm (317). Let us show the implication $\subset$. Let s be a section of the left hand side of (318). Let take a section g of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$ as in Lemma 15.17. The section g induces the section of ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$, which is the inverse image $f^{-1}_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}(s)$. Hence we have only to show that the element $g\cdot\eth_m$ induces the trivial element of ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_m,\boldsymbol{d})$.

We put $\boldsymbol{c}' := \boldsymbol{c} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_m$. Then $g \cdot \eth_m$ is a section of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$. For any subset $I \subset \underline{m}$, we have the projection $\tilde{\pi}_I : {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{q_J(\boldsymbol{c}'+\boldsymbol{d})}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$, as in the subsubsection 15.3.1. By our choice of g, we have the following, in the case $I \subset \underline{m}$:

$$\tilde{\pi}_I\big(-\big(g \cdot \eth_m\big)_{|\mathcal{D}_I}\big) \in \operatorname{Im}\Big(\prod_{\substack{i \in I,\\ i \leq m-1}} (\operatorname{Res}_i(\mathbb{D}) + \lambda)\Big).$$

Moreover, we have $\tilde{\pi}_I\big(-\big(g \cdot \eth_m\big)_{|\mathcal{D}_I}\big) = 0$ in the case $m \in I \subset \underline{m}$.

We put $\boldsymbol{d}' := (c_{m+1}, \ldots, c_k, d_{k+1}, \ldots, d_l) \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{l}-\underline{m}}$. Then we obtain $g \cdot \eth_m \in \mathcal{L}_{m-1, \boldsymbol{d}'-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}$. Due to Corollary 15.6, we obtain the following:

$$g \cdot \eth_m \in \sum_{I \subset \underline{m-1}} \mathcal{L}_{0, \boldsymbol{d}'-\boldsymbol{\delta}_I-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{I^c}} \cdot \prod_{i \in I} \eth_i.$$

Here we put $I^c := \underline{m} - I$. Note $\mathcal{L}_{0,\boldsymbol{d}'-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{I^c}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_I} \cdot \eth_I \subset {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'+\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$. Hence we obtain $g \cdot \eth_m \in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_m+\boldsymbol{d}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_m}(\mathfrak{E})$, which means the vanishing $g \cdot \eth_m = 0$ in ${}^{\underline{k}}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d})$. Therefore we obtain the implication $\subset$ in (318). Thus we obtain Lemma 15.34 and Lemma 15.33. ∎

15.3.3 ${}^{\underline{l}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$ and ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$

In particular, we have the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{l}}T^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c})$ for any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{l}}$. For any $\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, i, c_i)$, we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) := {}^{\underline{l}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{u}) \subset {}^{\underline{l}}\tilde{T}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{c}).$$

We have another characterization. The action of $\prod_{u \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,i,c_i)}\big(z_i \cdot \eth_i + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)\big)^N$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is 0 if N is sufficiently large. Hence we obtain the following:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{l} \operatorname{Ker}\big(z_i\eth_i + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i)\big)^N.$$

We have the decomposition:

$${}^{\underline{l}}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_i \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda,i,c_i)} {}^{\underline{l}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}).$$

For any $\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_i \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, i, c_i)$, we take a sufficiently large integer N such that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, u_i) - N\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 < 0$ for any i. We put ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) := {}^{\underline{l}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(\mathfrak{E})$. Here $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}$ denote the element $(\overbrace{\boldsymbol{\delta}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_0}^{l}) \in (\boldsymbol{C} \times \boldsymbol{R})^l$. It is well defined in the sense that we have the canonical isomorphism $\prod_i z_i^{N'-N} : {}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(\mathfrak{E}) := {}^{\underline{l}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}-N'\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(\mathfrak{E})$ for two choices N and N'.

Recall that we have the coherent sheaves ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ $(\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{l}))$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ (the subsubsection 8.9.1). We have ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(E) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$ by definition, when $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) < 0$. Since we have the canonical isomorphism $\prod_i z_i^N : {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(E)$, we obtain the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$ for any $\boldsymbol{u} \in \prod_i \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda, i, c_i)$.

We have the nilpotent part $\mathcal{N}_i$ of the residue $\operatorname{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}^{\lambda_i}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(E)$. On the other hand, we have the nilpotent part $\mathcal{N}_i$ of $-z_i \cdot \eth_i$ on ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$.

Lemma 15.35 *The isomorphism preserves the nilpotent morphisms $\mathcal{N}_i$.*

Proof The $\operatorname{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ corresponds to the left action of $z_i \cdot \eth_i = \eth_i \cdot z_i - \lambda$, which corresponds to the right action of $-z_i \cdot \eth_i - \lambda$. ∎

In particular, we obtain the following.

Lemma 15.36

- *When $\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1) \subset \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, we have the canonical isomorphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_1)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}$.*
- *Hence we obtain the globally defined $\mathcal{R}$-module ${}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{l}}$.*
- *We have the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(E) \simeq {}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$. It preserves the nilpotent parts of* $\operatorname{Res}(\mathbb{D})$ *and $-z_i \cdot \eth_i$.* ∎

15.4 Relation of the filtrations of $\mathfrak{E}$

15.4.1 Preliminary

For $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$, we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) := \bigl\{ \boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{c} \leq \boldsymbol{b} \bigr\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}^0(\boldsymbol{b}) := \bigl\{ \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{c} \neq \boldsymbol{b} \bigr\}.$$

Definition 15.2 *Let $S \subset \boldsymbol{R}^I \cap \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, I)$ be a finite subset. It is called primitive, if the following holds:*

- *For any $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{b}' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\boldsymbol{b} \neq \boldsymbol{b}'$, we have $\boldsymbol{b} \notin \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}')$.* ▌

For a finite subset $S \subset \boldsymbol{R}^I \cap \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, I)$, we put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(S) := \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}), \quad \mathcal{S}^0(S) := \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} \mathcal{S}^0(\boldsymbol{b}).$$

The following lemma can be checked elementarily.

Lemma 15.37 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ such that $\boldsymbol{n} \notin \mathcal{S}(S)$. Then there does not exist the following decomposition:*

$$\prod_{i \in I} z_i^{-n_i} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}(z) \cdot \prod_{i \in I} z_i^{-b_i}.$$

Here $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ ($\boldsymbol{b} \in S$) denote holomorphic functions on Δ^I. ▌

15.4.2 The filtrations ${}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$

For $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{l}-I}_{<0}$, we put as follows:

$${}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathcal{S}(S)} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}), \qquad {}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathcal{S}^0(S)} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}).$$

Similarly we put as follows, for any $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{l}-I}$:

$${}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr), \quad {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathcal{S}'(S)} {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

Lemma 15.38 *There exists a finite subset S', such that ${}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr) = {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S',\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)$ and ${}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr) = {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S',\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.*

Proof It follows from the discreteness of the set $\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, I)$. ▌

We have the naturally defined morphism:

$${}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

If S consists of the unique element $\boldsymbol{c}$, we have the following by definition:

$$\frac{{}^I\mathcal{V}_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)}{{}^I\mathcal{V}'_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)} \simeq {}^I T(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d}), \qquad \frac{{}^I\mathcal{V}_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)}{{}^I\mathcal{V}'_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)} \simeq {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}} {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

Here we put $J := \underline{l} - I$.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$. We put $J := \underline{l} - I$. Let $\boldsymbol{d}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ be a frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. We put ${}^j\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) := {}^j\deg^{F^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) - 1$, and $\boldsymbol{d}(v_i) := \bigl({}^j\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(v_i) \,\big|\, j \in I\bigr)$. For any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$, we have the element $\boldsymbol{n}(v_i, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ determined by the condition $\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{\delta} < \boldsymbol{n}(v_i, \boldsymbol{c}) + \boldsymbol{d}(v_i) \leq \boldsymbol{c}$. When we put $\tilde{v}_i := v_i \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_i, \boldsymbol{c})}$, the tuple $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} := \bigl(\tilde{v}_i\bigr)$ is a frame of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$, which is compatible with $F^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$. Here $z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_i, \boldsymbol{c})}$ denotes $\prod_j z_j^{-n_j(v_i, \boldsymbol{c})}$.

Lemma 15.39 *Let* $\boldsymbol{c}$ *be an element of* $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ *and* S *be a subset of* $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ *such that* $\boldsymbol{c} \notin \mathcal{S}(S)$*. For any section* $f \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E}) \cap {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$*, we have* $f = 0$ *in* ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$*.*

Proof We put $\tilde{v}_i := v_i \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_i,\boldsymbol{c})}$. Then we have the description $f = \sum \tilde{f}_i \cdot \tilde{v}_i = \sum \tilde{f}_i \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_i,\boldsymbol{c})} \cdot v_i$, for holomorphic functions $\tilde{f}_i$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Assume that $f \neq 0$ in ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^JV_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$, and we will derive a contradiction. Under the assumption, we have the following:

$$\Big(\sum_{\boldsymbol{d}(v_a)+\boldsymbol{n}(v_a,\boldsymbol{c})=\boldsymbol{c}} \tilde{f}_a \cdot \tilde{v}_a\Big)_{|\,\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \neq 0.$$

Then there exists i_0 such that $\boldsymbol{d}(v_{i_0}) + \boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{c}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i_0\,|\,\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} \neq 0$.

On the other hand, since we have $f \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$ by our assumption, we have the description $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ for some sections $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. For each $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$, we have the description $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \sum f_{\boldsymbol{b},i} \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_i,\boldsymbol{b})} \cdot v_i$ for holomorphic functions $f_{\boldsymbol{b},i}$ on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

As a result, we have the equality:

$$\tilde{f}_{i_0} \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{c})} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b},i_0} \cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{b})}. \tag{319}$$

Lemma 15.40

$$\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{c}) \notin \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S} \mathcal{S}\big(\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{b})\big).$$

Proof Assume that $\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathcal{S}\big(\boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{b})\big)$ for some $\boldsymbol{b} \in S$. Then we have the following:

$$\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{d}(v_{i_0}) = \boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{c}) \leq \boldsymbol{n}(v_{i_0},\boldsymbol{b}) \leq \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{d}(v_{i_0}).$$

Thus we obtain $\boldsymbol{c} \leq \boldsymbol{b}$, which contradicts our assumption $\boldsymbol{c} \notin \mathcal{S}(S)$ of Lemma 15.39. Hence we obtain Lemma 15.40. ∎

Thus the equality (319) and Lemma 15.37 contradicts, and the proof of Lemma 15.39 is accomplished. ∎

For a primitive subset $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^I_{\geq 0}$, we have the natural surjection:

$$\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\, {}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big) \longrightarrow \frac{{}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})}{{}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})}. \tag{320}$$

Corollary 15.7 *The morphism* (320) *is isomorphic.*

Proof We have only to show the injectivity of (320). Let us consider sections $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \in {}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$ $(\boldsymbol{b} \in S)$ such that the summation $g = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ is contained in ${}^I\mathcal{V}'_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b}_1 \in S$, we have $f_{\boldsymbol{b}_1} = g - \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S-\{\boldsymbol{b}_1\}} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. Hence there exists a finite subset S' such that $\boldsymbol{b}_1 \notin \mathcal{S}(S')$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{b}_1} \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_{\boldsymbol{b}_1,\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big) \cap {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S',\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. Due to Lemma 15.39, we obtain $f_{\boldsymbol{b}_1} = 0$ in ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}_1}\, {}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$. It implies the injectivity of the morphism (320). ∎

15.4.3 The comparison of ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S(\mathfrak{E})$ and ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$

For a primitive subset S, we have the following naturally defined commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} {}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{d}) \arrow[r, "g'", "\text{injective}"'] \arrow[d, "f", "\text{sur}"'] & \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} {}^I\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\, {}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big) \arrow[d, "f'", "\simeq"'] \\
\dfrac{{}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})}{{}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})} \arrow[r, "g"] & \dfrac{{}^I\mathcal{V}_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)}{{}^I\mathcal{V}'_{S,\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{321}$$

Lemma 15.41 *The morphism g in* (321) *is injective, and the morphism f in* (321) *is isomorphic. We have* $\mathrm{Im}(g) = f'\bigl(\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} {}^I T_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigr)$.

Proof It immediately follows the diagramm (321). Note we have $\mathrm{Im}(g') = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} {}^I T_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. ▮

Let S be a primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$.

Proposition 15.1 *We have* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr) = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr) \cap \mathfrak{E}$.

Proof The implication $\subset$ is clear. Thus we have only to show the implication $\supset$. Let N be a large number such that $-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta} < \boldsymbol{b}$ for any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in S$.

Let f be a section of $\mathfrak{E}\cap {}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. We have the following description:

$$f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in T} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}.$$

Here T denotes some primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^l$, and $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ are sections of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)$. If T is contained in $\mathcal{S}(S)$, then f is contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{V}_S(\mathfrak{E})$, and thus there are nothing to show. We will give an algorithm to replace the primitive subset T when T is not contained in $\mathcal{S}(S)$.

In general, we put $P(\boldsymbol{b}) := \bigl\{i\in\underline{l}\,\big|\, b_i > -N\bigr\}$ for any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^l$. Then we put $T_j := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{b}\in T\,\big|\,|P(\boldsymbol{b})| = j\bigr\}$. We divide T_j into $T_j^\star \sqcup T_j^\times$, where we put as follows:

$$T_j^\star := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{b}\in T_j\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{b}\in\mathcal{S}(S)\bigr\},\quad T_j^\times := T_j - T_j^\star.$$

Lemma 15.42 *We have* $T_0 = T_0^\star$.

Proof It follows from our choice of N. ▮

We divide $T_j^\times$ as follows:

$$T_j^\times = \coprod_{\substack{I\subset\underline{l},\\ |I|=j}} T_I^\times,\qquad T_I^\times := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{b}\in T_j^\times\,\big|\,P(\boldsymbol{b}) = I\bigr\}.$$

We have the naturally defined morphism $\pi_I : T_I^\times \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^I_{>-N}$. We put $S_I^\times := \pi_I\bigl(T_I^\times\bigr)$. For any element $\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times$, we put $T_I^\times(\boldsymbol{c}) := \pi_I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{c})$. Then we have the decomposition:

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{l}\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in T_j^\star} f_{\boldsymbol{b}} + \sum_{|I|=j}\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times}\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in T_I^\times(\boldsymbol{c})} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Bigr).$$

Note that $T\subset\mathcal{S}(S)$ is equivalent to $\bigcup_m T_m^\times = \emptyset$. Hence we put as follows, when $T\not\subset\mathcal{S}(S)$:

$$m_0(T) := \max\bigl\{m\,\big|\,T_m^\times \neq \emptyset\bigr\}.$$

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$ such that $|I| = m_0(T)$ and $S_I^\times \neq\emptyset$. For any element $\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times$, we put $|\boldsymbol{c}| := \sum_{i\in I}(c_i + N) > 0$. We put as follows:

$$q_0(T) := \max\Bigl(\bigcup_{|I|=m_0(T)}\bigl\{|\boldsymbol{c}|\,\mid\,\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times\bigr\}\Bigr).$$

We also put as follows:

$$r_0(T) := \Bigl|\bigcup_{|I|=m_0(T)}\bigl\{\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times\,\big|\,|\boldsymbol{c}| = q_0\bigr\}\Bigr|.$$

Let take $\boldsymbol{c}\in S_I^\times$ such that $|\boldsymbol{c}| = q_0(T)$. We have the section:

$$F_{\boldsymbol{c}} := \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in T_I^\times(\boldsymbol{c})} f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr) \subset {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr).$$

Here we put $J := \underline{l} - I$.

We have the induced section $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}}]$ of ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c}, -N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J) = {}^I\tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{c}, -N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J) \subset {}^I\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\;{}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$.

Lemma 15.43 *Assume* $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}}] \neq 0$. *Then we have some primitive subset* $U_0 \subset \boldsymbol{R}^J_{\leq -N}$ *and the decomposition* $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}}] = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in U_0} G_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$, *where* $G_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ *are sections of* ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}) \subset {}^I \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$, *such that the induced section* $[G_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}]$ *is not* 0 *in* ${}^I \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big) = {}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. *(Note Lemma* 15.6.*)*

Proof The filtrations ${}^j V^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$ $(j \in J)$ induces the filtrations ${}^j V^{(\lambda_0)}$ of ${}^I \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. Since the induced morphisms $\eth_i$ $(i \in I)$ are strict with respect to the filtrations ${}^j V^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(j \in J)$ (see Lemma 15.7), we have the following equalities for any $\boldsymbol{d} \leq -N \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}$:

$$ {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}} \cap {}^I \tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{c}, -N \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_J) = {}^I \tilde{T}(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d}). $$

Then the claim follows immediately. ∎

Corollary 15.8 *Assume* $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}}] \neq 0$ *in* ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c}, -N \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta})$. *Then we have some primitive subset* $U_0 \subset \boldsymbol{R}^J_{\leq -N}$ *and the decomposition* $F_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in U_0} F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$, *where* $F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ *is a section of* ${}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big(\mathfrak{E}\big)$ *such that the induced section* $[F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}]$ *is not* 0 *in* ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$.

Proof Due to Lemma 15.43, we have the decomposition $F_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in U_0} F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$ such that $[F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}] \neq 0$ in ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$. Then we obtain the claim due to Lemma 15.33. ∎

Then we obtain the decomposition:

$$ f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in T - T^{\times}_I(\boldsymbol{c})} f_{\boldsymbol{b}} + \sum_{\boldsymbol{d} \in U_0} F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}. $$

Recall we have $|I| = m_0(T)$, which we denote by m_0 for simplicity.

Lemma 15.44 *For any* $\boldsymbol{d} \in U_0$, *there exists an element* $\boldsymbol{b} \in \bigcup_{m_0 \leq m} T^\star_m$, *such that* $\boldsymbol{c} + \boldsymbol{d} \leq \boldsymbol{b}$.

Proof Let us consider the following two cases:

Case 1. There exists an element $\boldsymbol{b} \in T - T^{\times}_I(\boldsymbol{c})$ such that $\boldsymbol{c} + \boldsymbol{d} \leq \boldsymbol{b}$.

Case 2. There does not exist such element.

In the case 1, we have $\boldsymbol{c} \leq q_I(\boldsymbol{b})$. Hence we have $\boldsymbol{b} \in \bigcup_{m_0 < m} T_m$ or $\boldsymbol{b} \in T_{m_0}$. Due to our choice of m_0, we have $\bigcup_{m_0 < m} T_m = \bigcup_{m_0 < m} T^\star_m$. Due to our choice of m_0 and $\boldsymbol{c}$, we have the following:

$$ \big\{ \boldsymbol{b} \in T_{m_0} - T^{\times}_I(\boldsymbol{c}) \,\big|\, q_I(\boldsymbol{b}) \geq \boldsymbol{c} \big\} \subset T^\star_{m_0}. $$

Thus we obtain $\boldsymbol{b} \in \bigcup_{m_0 \leq m} T^\star_m$ in this case.

Let us consider the case 2. Then we obtain $F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}} = 0$ in ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$ due to Lemma 15.39. It contradicts our choice of $F_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d}}$. Hence we can conclude that the case 2 does not happen. ∎

Corollary 15.9 *In the case* $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}}]$ *is not* 0 *in* ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{d})$, *we have some sections* $H_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ $(\boldsymbol{b} \in \bigcup T^\star_m)$ *satisfying the following:*

- $H_{\boldsymbol{b}} \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J}\big(\mathfrak{E}\big) \cap {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})$.
- $[F_{\boldsymbol{c}} - \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}} H_{\boldsymbol{b}}] = 0$ *in* ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c}, -N \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_J)$. ∎

We put $\tilde{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}} := F_{\boldsymbol{c}} - \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}} H_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in T^\star := \bigcup T^\star_m$, we put $\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b}} := f + H_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in T - \big(T^\star \cup T^{\times}_I(\boldsymbol{c})\big)$, we put $\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b}} := f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. Then we have the following decomposition:

$$ f = \sum_{T - T^{\times}_I(\boldsymbol{c})} \tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b}} + \tilde{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}. $$

Since the induced section $[\tilde{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}}]$ is 0 in ${}^{I}T(\boldsymbol{c}, -N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J)$, there is some primitive set $U_1 \subset \boldsymbol{R}^l$ and the decomposition: $\tilde{F}_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}'\in U_1}\overline{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}$ such that the following conditions hold for any element $\boldsymbol{b}'\in U_1$:

$$q_J(\boldsymbol{b}') \leq -N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_J, \quad \sum_{i\in I}(b_i+N) < r_0.$$

We obtain the following decomposition:

$$f = \sum_{T-T_I^{\times}(\boldsymbol{c})}\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b}} + \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}'\in U_1}\overline{F}_{\boldsymbol{b}'}.$$

Then it is easy to obtain a decomposition $\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in T'} f'_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ for a primitive subset $T'\subset\boldsymbol{R}^l$ satisfying the following in the lexicographic order:

$$\bigl(m_0(T'), r_0(T'), q_0(T')\bigr) < \bigl(m_0(T), r_0(T), q_0(T)\bigr).$$

It is easy to see that the reduction procedure above can stop in finite times. Thus the proof of Proposition 15.1 is accomplished. ▮

Corollary 15.10 *We have* ${}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}\cap{}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. ▮

15.4.4 The distributivity of the filtrations $\bigl({}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E})\bigm| i\in\underline{l}\bigr)$

Corollary 15.11 *We have* ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E}) = {}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$. *In particular, we have* ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}(\mathfrak{E}) = {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$.

Proof For any section $f\in{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$, there exists an element $\boldsymbol{c}$ such that $q_I(\boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{b}$ and $f\in{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$. Hence $f\in{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})$, and thus $f\in{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})$. Thus we obtain the implication $\supset$. The inverse implication $\subset$ can be shown similarly. ▮

Corollary 15.12 *We have* ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E}) = \bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})$.

Proof If $f\in\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b_i}(\mathfrak{E})$, then we obtain $f\in\bigcap_{i\in I}{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b_i}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$. It implies $f\in{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)\cap\mathfrak{E}$. Thus we obtain $f\in{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})$. It implies the implication $\supset$. The reverse implication is clear. ▮

The following lemma can be shown similarly.

Lemma 15.45 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$ such that $i\notin I$. Let S be a primitive subset of $\mathbb{Z}^{I}_{\geq 0}$. Then we have the following:*

$${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}(\mathfrak{E})\cap\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})\Bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S}{}^{I\sqcup\{i\}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{(\boldsymbol{c},b)}(\mathfrak{E}).$$

Proof We have only to use Proposition 15.1. ▮

Corollary 15.13 *We have the natural isomorphism:*

$${}^{i}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{b}{}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{I\sqcup\{i\}}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{(\boldsymbol{c},b)}(\mathfrak{E}). \tag{322}$$

Proof The left hand side of (322) is isomorphic to the following, by definition:

$$\text{L.H.S.} = \frac{{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})}{{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}{}^{I}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E}) + {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\cap\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}'\lneq\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}(\mathfrak{E})} \simeq \frac{{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})}{{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{c}'\lneq\boldsymbol{c}}{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}'}{}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}(\mathfrak{E})}.$$

The last term is the right hand side of (322). Thus we are done. ▮

Corollary 15.14 *The $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathfrak{E}$ is coherent and holonomic.*

Proof Let us consider the filtrations ${}^{i}\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\mathfrak{E}$ indexed by $\boldsymbol{R}_{\geq -1}$, given as follows:

$$
{}^{i}\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a} := \begin{cases} {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{a} & (a \geq -1) \\ 0 & (a < -1). \end{cases}
$$

We also consider the filtrations ${}^{i}F$ of $\mathcal{R}$ indexed by $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where ${}^{i}F_b$ is generated by the sections of $\mathcal{R}$ whose degree with respect to $\eth_i$ are less than b. Clearly we have the relation:

$$
{}^{i}F_b(\mathcal{R}) \cdot {}^{i}\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a} \subset {}^{i}\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}_{a+b}.
$$

We obtain the ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}(\mathcal{R})$-module ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E})$. We have the following:

$$
{}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\tilde{V}^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E}) = \bigoplus_{I \sqcup J = \underline{l}} \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}_{\geq -1}} {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_J}(\mathfrak{E}).
$$

Hence it is coherent as a ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathrm{Gr}^{F}(\mathcal{R})$-module. By using a standard theory of filtered ring sheaves (see the appendices in [5] or [29]), we can show that $\mathfrak{E}$ is a coherent $\mathcal{R}$-module. Similarly, we can show that the characteristic variety of $\mathfrak{E}$ is contained in $(N^*_X X \bigcup_I N^*_{D_I} X) \times \boldsymbol{C}$, where $N^*_Y X$ denotes the cotangent bundle of Y in X. Then we obtain that $\mathfrak{E}$ is holonomic. ▮

Let $\mathcal{R}_i$ denote the subsheaves of $\mathcal{R}$ generated by $\eth_j$ $(j \neq i)$ as algebra. We have the natural action of $\mathcal{R}_i$ on ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\mathfrak{E}$.

Corollary 15.15 *$\mathfrak{E}$ is regular along $z_i = 0$, namely, ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}(\mathfrak{E})$ is coherent as an $\mathcal{R}_i$-module.*

Proof It can be shown similarly to Corollary 15.14. ▮

Lemma 15.46 *Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{l}$ be a decomposition. For any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{J}_{<0}$, the $\mathcal{R}$-module ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict.*

Proof We have the injection ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E}) \longrightarrow {}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})$. Then the claim immediately follows. ▮

Lemma 15.47 *Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{l}$ be a decomposition. For any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{J}$, the $\mathcal{R}$-module ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict.*

Proof In the case $I = \underline{l}$, the claim follows from Lemma 15.46. We use a descending induction on $|I|$. We assume that the claim holds for any I such that $|I| = m$, and then we will show the claim for I such that $|I| = m-1$. We may assume that $I = \underline{m-1}$.

We put $M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d}) := \{i \in J \mid d_i < 0\}$. We use a descending induction on $|M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d})|$. In the case $|M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d})| = |J|$, ${}^{\underline{m-1}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{\underline{m-1}^{c}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict due to Lemma 15.46. Assume we have proved the strictness holds in the case $|M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d})| > m$, and we will prove that the strictness holds in the case $|M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d})| = m$. Let pick an element $i \in J$ such that $d_i \geq 0$. We put $J' := J - \{i\}$ and $I' := I \sqcup \{i\}$. Let $\pi : \boldsymbol{R}^{J} \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{J'}$ denote the projection. By the hypothesis of the induction on $|I|$, ${}^{I'}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{(\boldsymbol{c},d)}\ {}^{J'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{d})}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict for any $d \in \boldsymbol{R}$. By the hypothesis of the induction on $|M_{-}(\boldsymbol{d})|$, ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{(\boldsymbol{c},b)}\ {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}-N\boldsymbol{\delta}_i}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict if N is sufficiently large. Thus we are done. ▮

Corollary 15.16 *${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is strict.*

Proof Since ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is an inductive limit of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\ {}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{d}}(\mathfrak{E})$ $(\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\underline{l}-I})$, the corollary immediately follows from Lemma 15.47. ▮

Corollary 15.17 *${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\mathfrak{E}$ is strictly specializable along $\mathcal{D}_i$ at λ_0.* ▮

Corollary 15.18 *The $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathfrak{E}$ is strictly S-decomposable along $\mathcal{D}_i$, and we have $\psi_{z_i,0}(\mathfrak{E}) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$.*

Proof We have already obtained strict specializability along λ_0 (Corollary 15.17). We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\psi_{z_i,0}(\mathfrak{E}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{var}"'] & {}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big) \arrow[d] \\
\psi_{z_i,-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathfrak{E}) \arrow[r] & {}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_{-1}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E}) \arrow[r] & {}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_{-1}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The horizontal arrows are injective, and the right vertical arrows are isomorphic. Hence we have $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}) = 0$.

Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$ such that $i \in I$. We put $J := \underline{l} - I$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be any element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ such that $q_i(\boldsymbol{c}) = 0$, and $\boldsymbol{d}$ be any element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$. Then the natural morphism ${}^I T(\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \boldsymbol{d}) \longrightarrow {}^I T(\boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{d})$ is surjective. Then we can show that ${}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_{-1}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E}) \longrightarrow {}^i\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\mathfrak{E})$ is surjective, by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 15.47. Thus we obtain $\psi_{z_i,0}(\mathfrak{E}) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$. ▮

Recall that we have ${}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$ (the subsubsection 15.3.3).

Lemma 15.48 *We have the isomorphism:*

$$ {}^{\underline{l}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{1}\widetilde{\psi}_{u_1}\Big({}^{2}\widetilde{\psi}_{u_2}\Big(\cdots {}^{l}\widetilde{\psi}_{u_l}(\mathfrak{E})\Big)\Big). $$

Proof We have only to show that there exists the canonical isomorphism as follows, in the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) < 0$:

$$ {}^{\underline{l}}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{1}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{u_1}\Big({}^{2}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{u_2}\Big(\cdots {}^{l}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{u_l}(\mathfrak{E})\Big)\Big). \tag{323} $$

Both of (323) are naturally isomorphic to ${}^{\underline{l}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{l}}}(E)$. ▮

15.4.5 Primitive Decomposition of sections of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$

The following lemma can be shown elementarily.

Lemma 15.49 *Let f be a holomorphic function on $\Delta_z^n \times \Delta_w^m$. There exists the unique primitive subset $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0}$ such that we have a holomorphic decomposition $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{p} \in S} z^{\boldsymbol{p}} \cdot a_{\boldsymbol{p}}(z, w)$ such that $a_{\boldsymbol{p}}(0, w) \neq 0$.* ▮

First let us consider the primitive sections of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$.

Definition 15.3 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{l}$. A section $f \in {}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$ is called I-primitive, if $f \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$ and $f \neq 0$ in ${}^I\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$.* ▮

The following lemmas are easy to see.

Lemma 15.50 *Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a frame of ${}^{\square}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\mathcal{E}$, which is compatible with $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $F^{(\lambda_0)}$. For any v_i, for any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^l$ and for any subset $I \subset \underline{l}$, the section $v_i \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{l} z_j^{-c_j} \cdot a$, $(a(0) \neq 0)$, is I-primitive.* ▮

Lemma 15.51 *Assume that f is I-primitive and ${}^I\deg^V(f) = \boldsymbol{c}$. For any section $g \in {}^I\mathcal{V}'_{\boldsymbol{c}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$, then $f + g$ is I-primitive such that ${}^I\deg^V(f + g) = \boldsymbol{c}$.* ▮

Lemma 15.52 *Let f be a section. There exists a finite subset $S \subset \boldsymbol{R}^I$ and a decomposition: $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. Here $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ is I-primitive such that ${}^I\deg(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.*

Let $\max(S)$ denote the set of the maximal elements of S. Then there exist the I-primitive sections $g_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ for $\boldsymbol{b} \in S$ such that ${}^I\deg(g_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$ and $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in \max(S)} g_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. ▮

Definition 15.4 *An I-primitive decomposition of f is a decomposition $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that the following holds:*

- *The subset $S \subset \boldsymbol{R}^I$ is primitive.*
- *The sections $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ are I-primitive such that ${}^I\deg(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.* ▮

Lemma 15.53 *For any section f of ${}^\square\mathcal{E}$, there exists an I-primitive decomposition.*

Proof We have a development $f = \sum f_i \cdot v_i$, and we have a primitive decomposition of f_i, as in Lemma 15.49. Then we obtain the decomposition $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S'} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ is I-primitive with ${}^I\deg(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$. Then we have only to apply Lemma 15.51. ▮

Lemma 15.54 *Let $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ be an I-primitive decomposition. Then the set S is canonically determined. For any $\boldsymbol{b} \in S$, the section $[f_{\boldsymbol{b}}]$ of ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$ is canonically determined.*

Proof Assume we have two primitive decomposition of f:

$$f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S} f_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}'\in S'} f'_{\boldsymbol{b}'}.$$

Assume $\boldsymbol{b} \in S$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \notin S'$, and we will derive a contradiction.

Let us consider $A = \big\{\boldsymbol{b}' \in S' \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{b} \leq \boldsymbol{b}'\big\}$. Assume $A \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\boldsymbol{b}' \in A$ is not contained in S. From the equality above, there exists S'' such that $\boldsymbol{b} \notin \mathcal{S}(S'')$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_{S''}$. It implies $[f_{\boldsymbol{b}'}] = 0$ in ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}'}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$, and thus we have arrived at the contradiction.

If $A = \emptyset$, by a similar argument, we obtain $[f_{\boldsymbol{b}}] = 0$ in ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$, thus we have arrived at the contradiction. Thus we obtain $\boldsymbol{b} \in S'$. By symmetry, we obtain $S = S'$.

We have the following:

$$f_{\boldsymbol{b}} - f'_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}'\in S-\{\boldsymbol{b}\}} (f_{\boldsymbol{b}'} - f'_{\boldsymbol{b}'}).$$

Thus we obtain $[f_{\boldsymbol{b}} - f'_{\boldsymbol{b}}] = 0$ in ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^\square\mathcal{E})$. ▮

Definition 15.5 *The set S above is denoted by ${}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f)$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in {}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f)$, we put as follows:*

$${}^I P_{\boldsymbol{b}}(f) := [f_{\boldsymbol{b}}] \in {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big).$$

▮

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 15.55 *$f \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_S\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big)$ if and only if ${}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f) \subset \mathcal{S}(S)$.* ▮

We have the natural inclusion $\iota : \mathfrak{E} \longrightarrow {}^\square\mathcal{E}$. For any section $f \in \mathfrak{E}$, we put ${}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f) := {}^I\mathrm{Prim}(\iota(f))$, and we put as follows:

$${}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f) := {}^I\mathrm{Prim}\big(\iota(f)\big) \in {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E}) \subset {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^\square\mathcal{E}).$$

Lemma 15.56 *$f \in {}^I\mathcal{V}_S(\mathfrak{E})$ if and only if ${}^I\mathrm{Prim}(f) \subset \mathcal{S}(S)$.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 15.12 and Lemma 15.55. ▮

15.5 The characterization of $\mathfrak{E}$

Proposition 15.2 *Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ be a coherent $\mathcal{R}$-module on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *The restriction $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}$.*
2. *We have the injection $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}} \longrightarrow \iota_*\mathcal{E}$, where ι denotes the open immersion $X - D \longrightarrow X$.*
3. *The $\mathcal{R}$-module $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ is holonomic. It is also regular and strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$.*

4. *Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$ be generic with respect to $\bigcup_i \mathcal{KMS}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, i)$. Then the specialization $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}}$ is strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$. We also have $\psi_{z_i,0}\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}} = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can})$.*
5. *Let ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ be the V-filtration along $z_i = 0$ at λ such that ${}^{i}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}})$ is strict. We put ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$. Then ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$ is a coherent locally free $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{X}}$-module, and $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ is generated by ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$.*

Then we have the natural isomorphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}} \simeq \mathfrak{E}$.

Proof First we remark that $\mathfrak{E}$ satisfies the conditions above. We have the isomorphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}} \simeq \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}}$, and we can regard $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$ as the $\mathcal{R}$-submodules of $\iota_*\mathcal{E}$, where ι denotes the open immersion $X - D \longrightarrow X$. We will show that they are same as the $\mathcal{R}$-submodules.

Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$ be generic with respect to $\mathcal{KMS}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, z_i) \cup \mathcal{KMS}(\mathfrak{E}, z_i)$. Let $\pi_i : X \longrightarrow D_i$ denote the naturally defined projection. We put $X_i := \pi_i^{-1}\left(D_i - \bigcup_{j\neq i} D_i \cap D_j\right)$ and $\mathcal{X}_i^{\lambda} := X_i \times \{\lambda\}$. Let us consider the restriction $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}_i^{\lambda}}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}_i^{\lambda}}$, which we denote by $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$ respectively.

Lemma 15.57 *The D-modules $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$ are regular holonomic. They are prolongation of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X_i\setminus D_i}$.*

Proof They are regular along $z_i = 0$. The restrictions to $X_i \setminus D_i$ are isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X_i\setminus D_i}$. Then the claims immediately follow. ∎

Let L be the local system corresponding for $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|X_i\setminus D_i}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ be the perverse sheaves corresponding to $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$. Since $\mathfrak{E}_i^{(\lambda)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ are strictly S-decomposable, and since $\psi_{z_i,0} = \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{can}$ for both of them, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are the intermediate extensions of L. Hence we have the isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \simeq \mathcal{F}$, extending the canonical isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{|X_i\setminus D_i} \simeq L \simeq \mathcal{F}_{|X_i\setminus D_i}$. Due to Riemann-Hilbert correspondence, we obtain the isomorphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda} \simeq \mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$, extending $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}^{\lambda}_{|X_i\setminus D_i} \simeq \mathcal{E} \simeq \mathfrak{E}^{\lambda}_{|X_i\setminus D_i}$.

Lemma 15.58 *The KMS-spectrum $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathfrak{E}, z_i)$ and $\mathcal{KMS}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, z_i)$ are same.*

Proof Let λ be any generic point. The V-filtration ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda)}$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$ along $z_i = 0$ induce the Kashiwara-Malgrange filtrations V of $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$ along $z_i = 0$. Let us consider the following sets:

$$\mathcal{S}p\big(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}, z_i\big) := \big\{\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}^V\big(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}\big) \neq 0\big\}, \qquad \mathcal{S}p\big(\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}\big) := \big\{\alpha \in \boldsymbol{C} \,\big|\, \mathrm{Gr}^V\big(\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}\big) \neq 0\big\}.$$

Then we have $\mathcal{S}p\big(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}, z_i\big) = \mathcal{S}p\big(\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}, z_i\big)$ for any generic λ, due to the uniqueness property of the graduation of Kashiwara-Malgrange filtration. Since the set of generic λ is uncountable, we obtain the coincidence $\mathcal{KMS}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, z_i) = \mathcal{KMS}(\mathfrak{E}, z_i)$. ∎

Lemma 15.59 *Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$ be generic. The V-filtrations of $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$, induced by ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda)}$, are same.*

Proof Let ${}^{i}V$ denote the induced V-filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda)}$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$. We put $A := \mathcal{KMS}(\mathfrak{E}, z_i) = \mathcal{KMS}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, z_i)$. We put $A(c) := \big\{u \in \mathcal{KMS}(\mathfrak{E}, z_i) \,\big|\, \mathfrak{p}(\lambda, u) = c\big\}$. Note we have the following:

$${}^{i}\,\mathrm{Gr}^V_c(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}^{\lambda}) = \bigoplus_{u\in A(c)} \mathbb{E}(z_i\eth_i, -\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)), \qquad {}^{i}\,\mathrm{Gr}^V_c(\mathfrak{E}^{\lambda}) = \bigoplus_{u\in A(c)} \mathbb{E}(z_i\eth_i, -\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)).$$

Then the coincidence of the V-filtration follows from the uniqueness of the Kashiwara-Malgrange filtration. ∎

Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}^*$ be generic. Let V be the induced V-filtration of $\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda}$ or $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda}$ by ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda)}$.

Lemma 15.60 *Let f be a section of $V_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^{\lambda})$. Then f naturally gives the section of $V_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E}_i^{\lambda})$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 15.59. ∎

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ and sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0. We will restrict our attention to the restrictions of $\mathfrak{E}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ to $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 15.61 *Let f be a section of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}})$. Then f naturally gives the section of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathfrak{E})$.*

Proof Let $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ be generic. Then the restriction $f_{|\mathcal{X}_i^\lambda}$ gives the section of $V_{<0}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_i^\lambda) = V_{<0}(\mathfrak{E}_i^\lambda)$. Due to Corollary 2.6, f gives the section of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\big(\mathfrak{E}\big)$. $\blacksquare$

Therefore we obtain the inclusion $j : {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}) \subset {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathfrak{E})$. Let $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ be generic.

Lemma 15.62 *The restriction of j to generic λ is isomorphic.*

Proof The restriction of j to $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i^\lambda$ is isomorphic due to Lemma 15.59. Since $\mathcal{X} - \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i^\lambda$ is of codimension 2 in $\mathcal{X}^\lambda$ and since both of ${}^{n}V(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}^\lambda)$ and ${}^{n}V(\mathfrak{E}^\lambda)$ are locally free, the restriction of j to generic λ is isomorphic. $\blacksquare$

Hence the inclusion j is isomorphic outside the closed subset whose codimension is larger than 2. Since both of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}})$ and ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\mathfrak{E})$ are locally free, we can conclude that the inclusion j is isomorphic.

Since $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ are generated by ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}$, they are same as the submodule of $\iota_*\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$. Thus the proof of Proposition 15.2 is accomplished. $\blacksquare$

16 The filtrations of $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$

We use the right $\mathcal{R}$-module structures in this section. We put $X = \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^n D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Note the remark in the subsubsection 15.2.4.

16.1 The filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$

16.1.1 Preliminary

Let l be a positive integer such that $l \leq n$. Let us pick an element $\boldsymbol{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_l) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^l$, and we put $g = \prod_{i=1}^l z_i^{m_i}$.

Remark 16.1 *The meaning of l is different from that in the previous section.* $\blacksquare$

We obtain $\mathfrak{E}$ and ${}^\square\mathcal{E}$, and thus $i_{g*}\mathfrak{E} = \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ and $i_{g*}\big({}^\square\mathcal{E}\big) = {}^\square\mathcal{E}[\eth_t]$. We regard them as a $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}\times \boldsymbol{C}}$-module. We have the following formulas (cf. [46]):

$$\begin{aligned} &(u \otimes \eth_t^j) \cdot a = u \cdot a \otimes \eth_t^j, && (u \otimes \eth_t^j) \cdot \eth_i = u\eth_i \otimes \eth_t^j - u(\partial_i g) \otimes \eth_t^{j+1}, \\ &(u \otimes \eth_t^j) \cdot t = u \cdot g \otimes \eth_t^j + j \cdot \lambda \cdot u \otimes \eth_t^{j-1}, && (u \otimes \eth_t^j) \cdot \eth_t = u \otimes \eth_t^{j+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{324}$$

We put $s_i := z_i\eth_i$ and $s := t\eth_t$. Then we have the following:

$$(u \otimes \eth^j) \cdot (s_i + m_i s) = us_i \otimes \eth_t^j + m_i \cdot \lambda \cdot j \cdot u \otimes \eth_t^j.$$

Here we put $m_i = 0$ for $i > l$. In the following, $(u \otimes 1)s^j$ is denoted by $u \otimes s^j$.

Lemma 16.1 *We have $(u \otimes s^j) \cdot s_i = (u \otimes 1)s_i s^j = us_i \otimes s^j - m_i u \otimes s^{j+1}$.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation from (324). $\blacksquare$

It is easy to check ${}^\square\mathcal{E}[\eth_t] = {}^\square\mathcal{E}[s]$.

Lemma 16.2 *For any section s of $i_{g*}{}^\square\mathcal{E}$, we have the following:*

$$(u \otimes s^j) \cdot \eth_i = (u \cdot z_i^{-1} \otimes s^j) \cdot s_i = u \cdot \eth_i \otimes s^j - m_i \cdot u \cdot z_i^{-1} \otimes s^{j+1}.$$

$\blacksquare$

16.1.2 The filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the endomorphisms

Following Saito [46], we introduce the filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$. For any negative real number b, we put as follows:

$$U_b^{(\lambda_0)}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}) := \bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\mathfrak{E}\otimes 1\bigr)\cdot\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

For any real number b, we put as follows:

$$U_b^{(\lambda_0)}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}) := \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{c}<0,\\ \boldsymbol{c}+j\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\leq b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}}\bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mathfrak{E}\otimes\eth_t^j\bigr)\cdot\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}} = \sum_{\substack{b'+j\leq b,\\ b'<0}} U^{(\lambda_0)}_{b'}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\cdot\eth_t^j.$$

For simplicity, we use the following notation:

$$\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)} := \mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\bigr).$$

It is the $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$-module.

Lemma 16.3 *The following immediately follows from the construction.*

- $U_a^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}\bigr)\cdot V_m\mathcal{R}\subset U_{a+m}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}\bigr)$.
- *The induced morphism* $t: U_b^{(\lambda_0)}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E})\longrightarrow U_{b-1}^{(\lambda_0)}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E})$ *is onto if* $b<0$.
- *The induced morphism* $\eth_t:\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\Psi_{b+1}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is onto if* $b\geq -1$. ■

Lemma 16.4 *The following immediately follows from the definition.*

- $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is a coherent* $V_0\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$*-module.*
- *The filtration* $U^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is a good* V*-filtration.* ■

For $b=0$, we also put as follows:

$$U_0'^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]) := \bigl({}^{\underline{l}}V_0^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}\otimes 1\bigr)\cdot\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}},\quad \Psi'^{(\lambda_0)} := \frac{U_0'^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])}{U_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])}.$$

Lemma 16.5 *We have* $U_0^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\subset U_0'^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$*. In particular, we have the inclusion* $\Psi_0^{(\lambda_0)}\subset\Psi_0'^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Proof It immediately follows from the definition. ■

Lemma 16.6 *The induced morphism* $t:\Psi'^{(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\Psi_{-1}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is isomorphic.*

Proof It can be checked directly from the definition. ■

Corollary 16.1 $\Psi_0^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is isomorphic to the image of the induced morphism* $\eth_t:\Psi_{-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\Psi_0'^{(\lambda_0)}$*. The induced morphism* $t:\Psi_0^{(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\Psi_{-1}^{(\lambda_0)}$ *is injective.* ■

16.1.3 The endomorphisms

Let us pick a large integer N such that $N\geq\operatorname{rank}\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 16.7 *For any section* f *of* ${}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\bigr)$*, we have the following:*

$$f\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,i,b_i)}\bigl(s_i+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^N\in{}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}).$$

Here ϵ *denotes some positive number.* ■

For any section $f = f\otimes 1 \in {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})\otimes 1$, we put as follows:

$$\phi_{1,h}(f\otimes 1) := (f\otimes 1)\cdot s_h, \qquad \phi_{2\,h}(f\otimes 1) := (f\cdot s_h)\otimes 1.$$

Lemma 16.8 *The following claims can be checked by a direct calculation.*

- *We have the following equality in ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[s]$ for any $h\leq l$:*

$$(f\otimes 1)\cdot s = \frac{1}{m_h}\big(\phi_{2,h}(f\otimes 1) - \phi_{1,h}(f\otimes 1)\big). \tag{325}$$

- *We have the following:*

$$\phi_{1,h}(f\otimes 1) \in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_h}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})\cdot\eth_h,$$

$$\textstyle\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,h,b\cdot m_h)}\big(\phi_{2,h}+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^N(f\otimes 1)\in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}-\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta}_h}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}).$$

- *$\phi_{1,h}$ and $\phi_{2,h}$ are commutative.* ■

Lemma 16.9 *We have the following:*

$$(f\otimes 1)\cdot\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,h,b\cdot m_h)}\Big(s+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{m_h}\Big)^N \in \sum_{j\geq 0}{}^{\underline{l}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}-\epsilon\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_h}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})\cdot\eth_h^j.$$

Proof We have only to apply the lemmas above to the following:

$$\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,h,b\cdot m_h)}\Big(\frac{\phi_{2,h}+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)+\phi_{1,h}}{m_h}\Big)^N(f\otimes 1).$$

■

Corollary 16.2 *For any section f of ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\mathfrak{E}$, we have the following:*

$$(f\otimes 1)\cdot\prod_{h=1}^{l}\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,h,bm_h)}\Big(s+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{m_h}\Big)^N\in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}).$$

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 16.9. ■

We put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{KMS}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}^0) := \textstyle\bigcup_{h=1}^{l}\big\{u\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}\,\big|\,m_h\cdot u\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,h)\big\},\\ &\mathcal{K}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E},\lambda_0,b) := \big\{u\in\mathcal{KMS}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}^0)\,\big|\,\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=b\big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{326}$$

Corollary 16.3 *If $N > l\cdot\mathrm{rank}(\mathcal{E})$, we have the following:*

$$(f\otimes 1)\cdot\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)}\big(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^N\in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{E}).$$

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 16.2. ■

We put as follows:

$$F_b(x) := \prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)}\big(x+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^N. \tag{327}$$

Lemma 16.10 *The action of $F_b(s)$ vanishes on $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ for any b.*

Proof In the case $b<0$, it immediately follows from Corollary 16.3. By using the surjectivity of the induced morphisms $\eth_t:\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{c-1}\longrightarrow\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_c$ $(c\geq 0)$ and the obvious relation $\eth_t\circ F_{c-1}=F_c\circ\eth_t$ for any real number c, we can reduce the general case to the case $b<0$. ■

16.1.4 The filtration ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}$

We put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V_0\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}[s_1, \ldots, s_n].$$

For any real number $b < 0$ and for any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l_{\leq 0} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{n-l}$, we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\big) := \big({}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\big(\mathfrak{E}\big) \otimes 1\big) \cdot {}^{\underline{n}}V_0\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Lemma 16.11 *For any negative number b and any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l_{\leq 0} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{n-l}$, we have the following:*

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} U_b^{(\lambda_0)} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t] = {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\big(\mathfrak{E}\big) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}[s].$$

Both of them are generated by ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})$ over ${}^{\underline{n}}V_0\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$. ▮

For any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n$, we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\big(U_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\big) := \sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{a}) \in S} {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\big(U_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\big) \cdot \eth^{\boldsymbol{n}},$$

Here we put $S := \big\{(\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{a}) \in \mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0} \times (\boldsymbol{R}^l_{\leq 0} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{n-l}) \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{n} + \boldsymbol{a} \leq \boldsymbol{c}\big\}$. The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 16.12 *We have ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} U_b^{(\lambda_0)} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t] \subset {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}[s]$.* ▮

The submodule ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} U_b^{(\lambda_0)} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ of $U_b^{(\lambda_0)} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ induces the submodule of $\mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}} \mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$. It is denoted by ${}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)})$.

16.2 Preliminary reductions and decompositions

16.2.1 Reductions I, II and III

We put $\boldsymbol{d}_0 := -\epsilon \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{n}-\underline{l}} = (\overbrace{0, \ldots, 0}^{l}, -\epsilon, \ldots, -\epsilon)$ for some sufficiently small positive number ϵ. In the following, let $\mathfrak{s}(\boldsymbol{n})$ denote the set $\big\{i \,\big|\, n_i \neq 0\big\}$ for an element $\boldsymbol{n} \in \boldsymbol{R}^l$. We use the coordinate $(z_1, \ldots, z_l, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-l})$. Note we use the notation in the subsubsection 15.4.1.

Reduction I.
Let f be a section of $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\big)$ for $b < 0$. We have a development:

$$f = \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}, \qquad \big(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \in {}^{\underline{l}}V_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})\big).$$

We take a primitive decomposition of each section $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}$ of ${}^{\underline{l}}V_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})$ given in the subsubsection 15.4.5. Namely, we take a decomposition of $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}$ as follows:

$$f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

Here $S(h, \boldsymbol{n})$ is a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $q_{\underline{l}}\big(S(h, \boldsymbol{n})\big) \subset \mathcal{S}(b \cdot \boldsymbol{m})$, and $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ are $\underline{n}$-primitive sections of $\mathfrak{E}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.

Then we obtain the following decomposition:

$$f = \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}. \tag{328}$$

Here $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ are $\underline{n}$-primitive sections of $\mathfrak{E}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.

The procedure to take a development as in (328) is called Reduction I. Note the following: if $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \in {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}$, then $S(h,\boldsymbol{n}) \subset \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{c})$.

Reduction II.
Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $q_{\underline{l}}(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}$. Let us consider a section of the form $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ for $\underline{n}$-primitive $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$. We consider the following condition.

(A2) There exists $j_0 \in \mathfrak{s}(\boldsymbol{n})$ such that $q_{j_0}(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq b\cdot m_{j_0} - 1$.

If $(A2)$ is satisfied, we have $q_{\underline{l}}(\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}) \leq b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}$, and thus $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}$ is contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}V_{b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\mathfrak{E}$. Thus we have the following equalities in $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} &= \bigl(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}\bigr) \otimes s^h s_{j_0} \cdot \bigl(\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}}\bigr) \\ &= \bigl(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}\bigr)\cdot s_{j_0} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}} - m_{j_0}\cdot\bigl(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}\bigr)\otimes s^{h+1}\cdot\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

We note $(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1})\cdot s_{j_0}$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}$ are sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}}\mathfrak{E}$. We also note $\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j,0} \lneq \boldsymbol{n}$.

Reduction III.
Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $q_{\underline{l}}(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}$. Let us consider a section of the form $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ for $\underline{n}$-primitive $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V}(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$. We put $K(\boldsymbol{b}) := \bigl\{i \bigm| i \leq l,\ q_i(\boldsymbol{b}) = b\cdot m_i\bigr\}$, and we consider the following condition:

(A3) $h \geq |K(\boldsymbol{b})|$.

Assume that $(A3)$ is satisfied. Since we have $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\prod_{k\in K} z_k \in {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_K} \subset {}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}$, we have the following:

$$f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^{h-|K(\boldsymbol{b})|}\cdot \prod_{k\in K(\boldsymbol{b})} s_k = \Bigl(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\prod_{k\in K(\boldsymbol{b})} z_i\Bigr)\otimes s^{h-|K(\boldsymbol{b})|}\cdot\prod_{k\in K(\boldsymbol{b})}\eth_k \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]. \tag{329}$$

In general, we have the following equality for any u, by using the formula (325):

$$u \otimes s^{h-|K|}\cdot\prod_{k\in K} s_k = \sum_{K'\subset K} u\cdot\prod_{k\in K'} s_k \otimes s^{h-|K'|}\cdot\prod_{k\in K-K'}(-m_k). \tag{330}$$

Thus we obtain the following:

Lemma 16.13 *If $(A3)$ is satisfied, we have the following decomposition modulo $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}$*

$$f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} \equiv -\sum_{\emptyset\neq K'\subset K(\boldsymbol{b})}(-1)^{|K'|}\cdot\Bigl(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\prod_{k\in K'}\widetilde{s}_k\Bigr)\otimes s^{h-|K'|}\cdot\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}, \qquad (\text{modulo}\, U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}). \tag{331}$$

Here we put $\widetilde{s}_i := m_i^{-1}\cdot s_i$. In the decomposition (331), the following holds:

- *$f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\cdot\prod_{k\in K'}\widetilde{s}_k$ is contained in ${}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}$.*
- *We have $h-|K'|<h$.*

Proof It immediately follows from (329) and (330). ∎

16.2.2 $(B1)$-decomposition

Definition 16.1 *A section f of $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ is called $(B1)$, if it has the following decomposition mod $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}$:*

$$f \equiv \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}\otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}. \tag{332}$$

(B1.1) *$f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ is $\underline{n}$-primitive such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^V(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.*

(B1.2) *Neither* $(A2)$ *nor* $(A3)$ *hold. i.e., the following holds for each* $(h, \boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{b})$ *such that* $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \neq 0$*:*

- *For any* $j \in \mathfrak{s}(\boldsymbol{n})$*, we have* $b \cdot m_j - 1 < q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq b \cdot m_j$*.*
- $h < |K(\boldsymbol{b})|$*.*

▮

Lemma 16.14 *Any section* f *of* $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ $(b < 0)$ *is* $(B1)$*. Moreover the condition* $(B1.3)$ *holds:*

(B1.3) *If* $f \in \sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S} {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)} U_b^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$*, we can take* $S(h, \boldsymbol{n}) \subset \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S} \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{n})$ *for any* h *and any* $\boldsymbol{n}$*.*

Proof By using the reduction I, we can take the development (328) satisfying $(B1.1)$ and $(B1.3)$. Then we have only to show that each $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ satisfies the condition $(B1)$.

We consider the following partial order on the set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \{(\boldsymbol{n}, h)\}$:

$$(\boldsymbol{n}', h') \leq (\boldsymbol{n}, h) \Longleftrightarrow \boldsymbol{n}' \leq \boldsymbol{n} \text{ and } h' \leq h.$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{n}, h) := \{(\boldsymbol{n}', h') \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \,|\, (\boldsymbol{n}', h') \leq (\boldsymbol{n}, h)\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n}, h) := \{(\boldsymbol{n}', h') \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{n}, h) \,|\, (\boldsymbol{n}', h') \neq (\boldsymbol{n}, h)\}.$$

Then we consider the following claims:

$P(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$**:** For any $(\boldsymbol{n}', h') \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$, any section $f_{h',\boldsymbol{n}',\boldsymbol{b}'} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ with $(B1.1)$ satisfies $(B1.2)$ and $(B1.3)$.

$Q(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$**:** For any $(\boldsymbol{n}', h') \in \mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$, any section $f_{h',\boldsymbol{n}',\boldsymbol{b}'} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ with $(B1.1)$ satisfies $(B1.2)$ and $(B1.3)$.

We have only to show the claims $P(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$ hold for any $(\boldsymbol{n}, h) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

In the case $(\boldsymbol{n}, h) = (0, 0)$, the condition $(B1.2)$ is trivial. Thus the claim $P(0, 0)$ holds. The claim $Q(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$ is equivalent to $\bigcup_{(\boldsymbol{n}',h')\in\mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n},h)} P(\boldsymbol{n}', h')$. Hence we have only to show $Q(\boldsymbol{n}, h) \Longrightarrow P(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$.

We make the following procedure to $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$:

- If $(A2)$ for $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ holds, then we make $\mathrm{Red}\, II + \mathrm{Red}\, I + \mathrm{Red}\, III + \mathrm{Red}\, I$.
- If $(A3)$ for $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ holds, then we make $\mathrm{Red}\, III + \mathrm{Red}\, I$.
- If neither $(A2)$ nor $(A3)$ hold, then $(B1.2)$ for $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ is already satisfied. Thus we do nothing. Note $(B1.3)$ also holds in this case.

By this procedure, we obtain the development of $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ modulo $U_{<b}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$:

$$f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} \equiv \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{n}',h')\in\mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n},h),\\ \boldsymbol{b}'\in S(\boldsymbol{n}',h')}} f'_{h',\boldsymbol{n}',\boldsymbol{b}'} \otimes s^{h'}\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}'}. \tag{333}$$

We may apply $Q(\boldsymbol{n}, h)$ to each term in the right hand side of (333). Thus the induction can proceed, and we obtain Lemma 16.14. ▮

Definition 16.2 *A development satisfying* $(B1.1)$*,* $(B1.2)$ *and* $(B1.3)$ *is called a* $(B1)$*-development.* ▮

16.2.3 Reductions I' and II'

Reduction I'

For any section $f \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\big(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\big)$, we have a development:

$$f = \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{l}_{\geq 0}} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}, \qquad \big(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \in {}^{l}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})\big).$$

By taking an $\underline{n}$-primitive decomposition of each section $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}$ of ${}^{l}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\mathfrak{E}$, we obtain a decomposition of the following form, as in Reduction I in the subsubsection 16.2.1:

$$f = \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}. \tag{334}$$

Here $S(h,\boldsymbol{n})$ denote subsets of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$, and $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ are $\underline{n}$-primitive sections of $\mathfrak{E}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.

Reduction II'

Let us consider a section of $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ of the form $f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ for $\underline{n}$-primitive $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that ${}^{\underline{n}}(f_{\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$. Let us consider the following condition:

$(A2')$ There exists $j_0 \in \mathfrak{s}(\boldsymbol{n})$ such that $q_{j_0}(\boldsymbol{b}) < b \cdot m_{j_0} - 1$.

Lemma 16.15 *If $(A2')$ is satisfied, we have the following:*

$$f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} = (f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}) \cdot s_{j_0} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}} - m_{j_0} \cdot (f_{\boldsymbol{b}} \cdot z_{j_0}^{-1}) \otimes s^{h+1} \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}}.$$

Proof Similar to Reduction II in the subsubsection 16.2.1. ∎

16.2.4 Reduction (B1')

Definition 16.3 *A section f of $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ is called $(B1')$, if it has a decomposition as follows:*

$$f = \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}. \tag{335}$$

(B1'.1) *$f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ is $\underline{n}$-primitive and ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V}(f_{h,\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{b}}) = \boldsymbol{b}$.*

(B1'.2) *$(A2')$ is not satisfied, i.e., For any $j \in \mathfrak{s}(\boldsymbol{n})$, the inequalities $b \cdot m_j - 1 \leq q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) < b \cdot m_j$ hold.* ∎

Lemma 16.16 *Any section $f \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ is $(B1')$.*

Proof The argument is essentially same as the proof of Lemma 16.14. By using $\mathrm{Red}\, I'$, there exists a decomposition (335) of f satisfying $(B1'.1)$. We have only to show that $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ with $(B1'.1)$ satisfies $(B1'.2)$.

Let us consider the following claims:

$P(\boldsymbol{n})$**:** For any $\boldsymbol{n}' \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{n})$, any section of the form $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}',\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ satisfies $(B1')$.

$Q(\boldsymbol{n})$**:** For any $\boldsymbol{n}' \in \mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n})$, any section of the form $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}',\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ satisfies $(B1')$.

We have only to show that the claims $P(\boldsymbol{n})$ holds for any $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. In the case $\boldsymbol{n} = 0$, the claim $P(0)$ is trivial. The claim $Q(\boldsymbol{n})$ is equivalent to $\bigcup_{\boldsymbol{n}' \in \mathcal{S}'(\boldsymbol{n})} P(\boldsymbol{n}')$. Thus we have only to show $Q(\boldsymbol{n}) \Longrightarrow P(\boldsymbol{n})$.

We make the following procedure to a section of the form $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$:

- If $(A2')$ for $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ holds, then we make $\mathrm{Red}\, II' + \mathrm{Red}\, I'$.
- If $(A2')$ does not hold, $(B1'.2)$ for $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is already satisfied, and thus we do nothing.

As in the proof of Lemma 16.14, we obtain a development of $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$, such that $Q(\boldsymbol{n})$ can be applied to each term. Thus we are done. ∎

16.3 Primitive decomposition

16.3.1 Preliminary

For any section f of $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$, we take a $(B1)$-development modulo $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$:

$$f \equiv \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}. \tag{336}$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}(f) := \Big\{\boldsymbol{n}+\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n \,\Big|\, \sum_h f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \neq 0\Big\}.$$

Then we obtain the set of the maximal elements of $\mathcal{T}(f)$, which is denoted by $\max\mathcal{T}(f)$.

Lemma 16.17 *Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\mathcal{T}(f)$. Then we have a decomposition $\boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{n}+\boldsymbol{b}$ such that $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \neq 0$ in* (336)*. Such $\boldsymbol{n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ is determined uniquely for $\boldsymbol{c}$.*

Proof Recall that $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^l_{\geq 0}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \in \boldsymbol{R}^n$. They satisfy the following conditions:

- $\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n} = \boldsymbol{c}$ holds.
- We have $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}) = q_i(\boldsymbol{c})$ in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{c}) \leq b\cdot m_i$, or $i > l$.
- We have $b\cdot m_i - 1 < q_i(\boldsymbol{b}) \leq b\cdot m_i$.

It is easy to see that these conditions determine uniquely $\boldsymbol{b}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}$. ■

Due to Lemma 16.17, we can use the notation '$(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})$' to describe an element of $\mathcal{T}(f)$. For maximal element $(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})$ of $\mathcal{T}(f)$, we put as follows:

$$P_{(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})}(f) := \sum_{h<|K(\boldsymbol{b})|} [f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}] \otimes s^h \in \bigoplus_{h<|K(\boldsymbol{b})|} \big({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\,\mathfrak{E}\big) \otimes s^h.$$

Proposition 16.1 *The set $\max\mathcal{T}(f)$ is canonically determined for a section f of $U^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\big(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\big)$. For each element $(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}) \in \max\mathcal{T}(f)$, the section $P_{(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})}(f)$ is canonically determined.*

Proof Let us take other $(B1)$-development of f:

$$f \equiv \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S'(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

We obtain the sets $\mathcal{T}'(f)$ and $\max\mathcal{T}'(f)$. We put as follows:

$$F := \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S'(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} - \sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S(h,\boldsymbol{n})} f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} \in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}\big(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\big).$$

Let $(\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0)$ be an element of $\max\big(\mathcal{T}(f)\cup\mathcal{T}'(f)\big)$. We have only to show the following:

$$\sum_h \big(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0} - f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0}\big) \otimes s^h \equiv 0, \quad \text{in} \sum_{h<|K(\boldsymbol{b})|} {}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E}) \otimes s^h. \tag{337}$$

Here we put $f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0} = 0$ (resp. $f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0} = 0$) if $(\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0) \notin \mathcal{T}(f)$, (resp. if $(\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0) \notin \mathcal{T}'(f)$). We assume that the equation (337) does not hold, and we will derive a contradiction.

We have the natural inclusion $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t] \subset {}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[\eth_t] = {}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[s]$. We regard F as a section of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[s]$. Note the development of a section $u \in {}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[\eth_t]$, of the following form:

$$u \otimes s^h \eth^{\boldsymbol{n}} = u z^{-\boldsymbol{n}} \otimes s^{h+|\boldsymbol{h}|} \cdot \prod (-m_i)^{n_i} + \sum_{h'<h+|\boldsymbol{n}|} a_{h'} \otimes s^{h'}. \tag{338}$$

Here $a_{h'}$ denote sections of ${}^{\square}\mathcal{E}$. If u is a section of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$, then $u\cdot z^{-\boldsymbol{n}}$ and $a_{h'}$ are sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)$.

Then we have the following:

$$(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}-f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}})\otimes s^h\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}}\in\bigoplus_{h\leq h'\leq h+|\boldsymbol{n}|}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\otimes s^{h'}.$$

We put $S''(h,\boldsymbol{n}):=S'(h,\boldsymbol{n})\cup S(h,\boldsymbol{n})$. Then we have the following:

$$F\in\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},h}\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S''(h,\boldsymbol{n})}\Big[\bigoplus_{h'<|K(\boldsymbol{b})|+|\boldsymbol{n}|}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\otimes s^{h'}\Big]=:\mathcal{L}.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0$ is assumed to be maximal, we have the following naturally defined projection:

$$\mathcal{L}\xrightarrow{\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0}}\bigoplus_{h'}{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}_0+\boldsymbol{n}_0}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\otimes s^{h'}.$$

We have the following:

$$\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0}(F)=\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0}\Big(\sum_h(f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0}-f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0})\otimes s^h\eth^{\boldsymbol{n}_0}\Big).$$

We put as follows:

$$h_0:=\max\big\{h\;\big|\;\big[f_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0}-f'_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0}\big]\neq0\text{ in }{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\mathfrak{E})\big\}.$$

By our choice of h_0, the coefficient of $s^{h'}$ in $\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0}(F)$ is as follows, due to (338):

$$\begin{cases}0, & (h'>h_0+|\boldsymbol{n}_0|),\\[2ex] \big[z^{-\boldsymbol{n}_0}\cdot(f_{h_0,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0}-f'_{h_0,\boldsymbol{n}_0,\boldsymbol{b}_0})\big], & (h'=h_0+|\boldsymbol{n}_0|).\end{cases}\tag{339}$$

On the other hand, we have a $(B1')$-development of $F\in U^{(\lambda_0)}_{<b}$:

$$F=\sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S_0'(h,\boldsymbol{n})}F_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}\otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$$

Here $F_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}$ is $\underline{n}$-primitive section of $\mathfrak{E}$, such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(F_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}})=\boldsymbol{b}$. As before we have the following, under the inclusion $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\subset{}^{\square}\mathcal{E}[s]$:

$$F\in\sum_{h,\boldsymbol{n}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S_0'(h,\boldsymbol{n})}{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}+\boldsymbol{n}}\big({}^{\square}\mathcal{E}\big)\otimes s^h=:\mathcal{L}_0'$$

We put $\mathcal{T}_0(F):=\big\{\boldsymbol{n}+\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n\;\big|\;\sum_h F_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}}\otimes s^h\neq0\big\}$.

Lemma 16.18 *For any element $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathcal{T}_0(F)$, the decomposition $\boldsymbol{c}=\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1$ is uniquely determined by the following conditions:*

- $\boldsymbol{n}_1\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$.
- $q_i(\boldsymbol{b})=q_i(\boldsymbol{c})$ *if* $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})<b\cdot m_i$*, or if* $i>l$.
- $b\cdot m_i-1\leq q_i(\boldsymbol{b})<b\cdot m_i$.

Proof Similar to Lemma 16.17. ∎

Let $\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1\in\mathcal{T}_0(F)$ be a maximal element. We have the naturally defined morphism:

$$\mathcal{L}_0'\xrightarrow{\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1}}\bigoplus\nolimits_{h'}{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}_1+\boldsymbol{n}_1}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})\otimes s^{h'}.$$

We have $\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1}(F)=\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1}\big(\sum_h F_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_1,\boldsymbol{b}_1}\otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_1}\big)$.

Lemma 16.19 *$\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0$ is an element of $\max\mathcal{T}_0(F)$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 15.54. ▮

Let us pick the decomposition $\boldsymbol{n}_1+\boldsymbol{b}_1=\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0$, uniquely given in Lemma 16.18

Lemma 16.20 *We have the following relation:*

$$\boldsymbol{n}_1=\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{K(\boldsymbol{b}_0)},\qquad \boldsymbol{b}_1=\boldsymbol{b}_0-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{K(\boldsymbol{b}_0)}.$$

Proof First we remark $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_0)\leq b\cdot m_i$ for any $i=1,\ldots,l$. In the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_0)<b\cdot m_i$, it is easy to check that $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_0)=q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_1)$. In the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_0)=b\cdot m_i$, we have $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_1)=b\cdot m_i-1$ and $q_i(\boldsymbol{n}_1)=1$, because of the condition $q_i(\boldsymbol{b}_1)<b\cdot m_i$. Thus we are done. ▮

We put $h_1:=\max\{h\,|\,F_{h,\boldsymbol{n}_1,\boldsymbol{b}_1}\neq 0\}$. The coefficient of $s^{h'}$ in $\pi_{\boldsymbol{n}_0+\boldsymbol{b}_0}(F)$ is as follows:

$$\begin{cases}[z^{-\boldsymbol{n}_1}\cdot F_{h_1,\boldsymbol{n}_1,\boldsymbol{b}_1}]\neq 0 & (h'=h_1+|\boldsymbol{n}_1|)\\ 0 & (h'>h_1+|\boldsymbol{n}_1|).\end{cases}\tag{340}$$

Note the following inequality due to Lemma 16.20 and $h_0<|K(\boldsymbol{b}_0)|$:

$$h_1+|\boldsymbol{n}_1|=h_1+|\boldsymbol{n}_0|+|K(\boldsymbol{b}_0)|\geq|\boldsymbol{n}_0|+|K(\boldsymbol{b}_0)|>|\boldsymbol{n}_0|+h_0$$

Then (339) and (340) contradict. Therefore the equation (337) holds, and thus the proof of Proposition 16.1 is accomplished. ▮

Corollary 16.4 *For any section $f\in\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}=\mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\bigr)$, the set $\max\mathcal{T}(f)$ is canonically determined. For any elements $(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})\in\max\mathcal{T}(f)$, the sections $P_{(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b})}(f)\in{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ are canonically determined.* ▮

Notation For any element $\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$, the decomposition $\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})=\boldsymbol{c}$ is determined by the following conditions:

- $\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$ and $\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})\in\boldsymbol{R}^l$.
- We have $q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))=q_i(\boldsymbol{c})$ in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})\leq 0$, or in the case $i>l$.
- We have $-1<q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))\leq 0$ in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{c})>0$ and $i\leq l$.

We also use the notation $M(\boldsymbol{c}):=\bigl\{i\,\big|\,i\leq l,\ q_i(\boldsymbol{c}_i)=0\bigr\}$ for any $\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$.

Recall that we put $\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}:=\mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\bigr)$. We have the naturally defined morphism (see the subsubsection 16.1.4 for the definition of ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on $U_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$):

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)[s]\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl(\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr).$$

It induces the following morphism:

$$\frac{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))}(s-\widetilde{s}_i^{\circ})}\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}.\tag{341}$$

Here the action of $\widetilde{s}_i^{\circ}$ on ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})[s]$ is induced by the action of $\widetilde{s}_i$ on ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})$.

Corollary 16.5 *The morphism (341) is isomorphic. In particular, ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_{\underline{n}}}$-module.*

Proof By using Proposition 16.1, it is easy to see that the morphism (341) is isomorphic. ▮

16.3.2 $\underline{n}$-primitive decomposition

Definition 16.4 *Let f be an element of $\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ for $b<0$. We put as follows:*

$$^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f) := \bigl\{\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n \bigm| \boldsymbol{c}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}\in\max\bigl(\mathcal{T}(f)\bigr)\bigr\}.$$

For any element $\boldsymbol{c}\in{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)$, we put as follows:

$$P_{\boldsymbol{c}}(f) := \Bigl[\sum_h f_{h,\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c}),\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\otimes s^h\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}\Bigr]\in{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

It is well defined due to Corollary 16.4. $\blacksquare$

Definition 16.5 *Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. A section f of $\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ is called $\underline{n}$-primitive such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f)=\boldsymbol{b}$, if the following holds:*

- $f\in{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$.
- $[f]\neq 0$ *in* ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$. $\blacksquare$

Definition 16.6 *For any section f of $\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$, an $\underline{n}$-primitive development is defined to be a development $f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S}f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$, where S denotes a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ and $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ ($\boldsymbol{b}\in S$) are $\underline{n}$-primitive such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(f_{\boldsymbol{b}})=\boldsymbol{b}$.* $\blacksquare$

Lemma 16.21 *For a section $f\in\mathrm{Gr}_b^U\,\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$, we have a $\underline{n}$-primitive development:*

$$f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)}f_{\boldsymbol{c}},\qquad f_{\boldsymbol{c}}\in{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_b^{U^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t].$$

Here $f_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ is primitive such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg(f_{\boldsymbol{c}})=\boldsymbol{c}$. We have $[f_{\boldsymbol{c}}]=P_{\boldsymbol{c}}(f)$ in ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$. $\blacksquare$

Definition 16.7 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I$, we put as follows:*

$${}^{I}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}) := \bigcup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n,\\ q_I(\boldsymbol{c})=\boldsymbol{b}}}{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}).$$

For any subset $S\subset\boldsymbol{R}^I$, we put ${}^{I}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}=\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S}{}^{I}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}$.

We use the notation ${}^{i}V_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ instead of ${}^{\{i\}}V_b^{(\lambda_0)}$. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 16.22 *Let b be a negative real number. Let S be a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. We have the following equivalence:*

$$f\in{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\Longleftrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)\subset\mathcal{S}(S).$$

Proof $\Longleftarrow$ is clear. We show $\Longrightarrow$. We have a development $f=\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S}f_{\boldsymbol{b}}$ such that $f_{\boldsymbol{b}}\in{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$. Due to $(B1.3)$, we obtain $\mathrm{Prim}(f_{\boldsymbol{b}})\subset\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b})$. Thus we obtain the result. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 16.6 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. Let S be a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. We have the following equivalence:*

$$f\in\sum_{\boldsymbol{b}\in S}{}^{I}V_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}\Longleftrightarrow q_I\bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)\bigr)\subset\mathcal{S}(S).$$

Proof $\Longleftarrow$ is clear. We show $\Longrightarrow$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in S$, we pick the element $\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$ appropriately satisfying $q_I(\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}})=\boldsymbol{b}$ and the following:

$$f\in{}^{\underline{n}}V_{\tilde{S}}^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)},\qquad\tilde{S}:=\bigl\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}\bigm|\boldsymbol{b}\in S\bigr\}.$$

Then we have ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)\subset\mathcal{S}(\tilde{S})$. It implies $q_I\bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)\bigr)\subset\mathcal{S}(S)$. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 16.7 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$, and $\boldsymbol{b} = \bigl(b_i \,\big|\, i \in I\bigr)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. We have the following:*

$$\bigcap_{i\in I} {}^iV_{b_i}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)} = {}^IV_{\boldsymbol{b}}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$$

Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$ and S be a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. Let i be an element of $\underline{n} - I$, and c be a real number. We put $I_1 = I \sqcup \{i\}$. We have the naturally defined subset $S_1 = \bigl\{(\boldsymbol{b}, c) \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{b} \in S\bigr\} \subset \boldsymbol{R}^{I_1}$. Then we have the following:

$${}^iV_c\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)} \cap \Bigl({}^IV_S\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}\Bigr) = \sum_j {}^{I_1}V_{S_1}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

Proof It is easy to check by using Corollary 16.6. ∎

Corollary 16.8 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$, and i be an element of $\underline{n} - I$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ and c be a real number. We put $I_0 = I \sqcup \{i\}$, and we have the naturally defined element $\boldsymbol{b}_0 = (\boldsymbol{b}, c) \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I_0}$. Then we have ${}^i\operatorname{Gr}_c^V {}^I\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^V \Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)} \simeq {}^{I_0}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}_0}^V \Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$.* ∎

16.4 Strict S-decomposability along $t = 0$

16.4.1 The local freeness of the sheaf ${}^I\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}} {}^JV_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(\boldsymbol{d} < 0)$

Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$, and we put $J := \underline{n} - I$. We put $I_0 := I \cap \underline{l}$ and $I_1 := \underline{n} - I_0$. We also put $J_0 := J \cap \underline{l}$ and $J_1 := \underline{n} - J_0$.

For any element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$, we take $\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) \in \boldsymbol{R}_{\leq 0}^{I_0} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{I_1}$ and $\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{I_0}$ determined by the following conditions:

- $\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + \vartheta(\boldsymbol{c}) = \boldsymbol{c}$.
- $q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})) = q_i(\boldsymbol{c})$ in the cases $q_i(\boldsymbol{c}) \leq 0$ or $i \in I_1$.
- $-1 < q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})) \leq 0$ in the case $q_i(\boldsymbol{c}) \geq 0$ and $i \in I_0$.

We put $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})) := \bigl\{i \in I_0 \,\big|\, q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})) = 0\bigr\}$.

For any elements $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$, we have the following morphisms:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\boldsymbol{d}+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)[s] \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}U^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\bigr) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow {}^I\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}} {}^IV_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

The composite of the morphisms is denoted by $\tilde{\Phi}$. Note the following:

- ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)[s] \cdot \prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))}(s - \tilde{s}_i^{\circ}) \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} \subset U_{<b}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ (Lemma 16.13). Here the action of $\tilde{s}_i^{\circ}$ on ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})[s]$ is given by the action of $\tilde{s}_i$ on ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})$.
- The image of ${}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\lneq\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+q_I(b\boldsymbol{m})}\,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}+q_J(b\boldsymbol{m})}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\bigr)[s]$ via $\tilde{\Phi}$ is contained in ${}^IV_{\lneq\boldsymbol{c}}{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{d}}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Thus the following morphism Φ is induced:

$$\Phi : \frac{{}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + b\boldsymbol{m}_I,\, \boldsymbol{d} + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\bigr)[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))}(s - \tilde{s}_i^{\circ})} \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})} \longrightarrow {}^I\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}} {}^JV_{\boldsymbol{d}}^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi_b^{(\lambda_0)}. \tag{342}$$

See the subsubsection 15.2.5 for ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}$. The action of $\tilde{s}_i^{\circ}$ on ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + b\boldsymbol{m}_I,\, \boldsymbol{d} + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\bigr)[s]$ is induced by the action of $\tilde{s}_i$ on ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + b\boldsymbol{m}_I,\, \boldsymbol{d} + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\bigr)$.

Proposition 16.2 *The morphism Φ is isomorphic.*

Proof First we show the surjectivity. Let f be an element of ${}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{d}}U_{b}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$. Let us take an $\underline{n}$-primitive decomposition of f:

$$f \equiv \sum f_{h,\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{b}} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

In the development, we have $\boldsymbol{b} \leq \varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + \boldsymbol{d} + b \cdot \boldsymbol{m}$ and $K(\boldsymbol{b}) \subset M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))$. Hence we obtain the surjectivity.

Let us show the injectivity. We have the natural projection:

$$\pi : {}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\boldsymbol{m}_I}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}_J}(\mathfrak{E})[s] \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})} \longrightarrow \frac{{}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+b\boldsymbol{m}_I}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}_J}(\mathfrak{E})[s] \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}}{\prod_{i \in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))}(s - \tilde{s}_i^{\circ})}. \tag{343}$$

Note that the right hand side of (343) is same as the left hand side of (342). Let us pick a non trivial section f of the right hand side of (343). We can pick a section $\tilde{f}$ of the left hand side of (343) satisfying the following:

- $\pi(\tilde{f}) = f$.
- We have a decomposition $\tilde{f} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in S_0} \tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b},h} \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}$. Here S_0 denotes a primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$, and $\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b},h}$ ($\boldsymbol{b} \in S_0$) are $\underline{n}$-primitive such that ${}^{\underline{n}}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b},h}) = \varpi(\boldsymbol{c}) + b \cdot \boldsymbol{m} + \boldsymbol{b}$.

To show the injectivity of Φ, we have only to show $\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{f}) \neq 0$.

We have $\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{f}) \in {}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S_0}\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b} \in S_0$, we have the following morphisms:

$${}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S_0}\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b} \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}+\boldsymbol{b}}\, \Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b} \simeq \frac{{}^{\underline{n}}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\varpi(\boldsymbol{c})+\boldsymbol{d}+b\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathfrak{E})[s]}{\prod_{i \in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{c}))}(s - \tilde{s}_i^{\circ})} \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}.$$

Here the left morphism is the naturally defined projection, and the right morphism is the isomorphism given in Corollary 16.5. The composite is denoted by $\pi_{\boldsymbol{b}}$. Then we have the following, which can be checked directly from the definition:

$$\pi_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big(\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{f})\big) = \sum_h [\tilde{f}_{\boldsymbol{b},h}] \otimes s^h \cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{c})}.$$

Then we obtain $\pi_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big(\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{f})\big) \neq 0$. Thus we obtain the injectivity of $\tilde{\Phi}$, and thus the proof of Proposition 16.2 is accomplished. ∎

Corollary 16.9 *Let I and J be subsets of $\underline{n}$ such that $\underline{n} = I \sqcup J$. Let b be a negative number, $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$, $\boldsymbol{d}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$. Then the sheaf ${}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^{J}\operatorname{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_I}$-locally free sheaf. In particular, it is strict.* ∎

16.4.2 Strictness of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}$ and the strict S-decomposability $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ along $t = 0$

Lemma 16.23 *Let b be a negative number. Let I and J be subsets of $\underline{n}$ such that $I \sqcup J = \underline{n}$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{d}$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^J$ respectively. Then the sheaf ${}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\big(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}\big)$ is strict.*

Proof For any element $\boldsymbol{d} \in \boldsymbol{R}^J$, we put as follows: $M_+(\boldsymbol{d}) := \big\{ i \,\big|\, q_i(\boldsymbol{d}) \geq 0 \big\}$. Note that $|M_+(\boldsymbol{d})| \leq |J|$. Let us consider the following claims:

$P(m,i)$**:** The strictness holds for $(J, \boldsymbol{d})$ such that $\big(|J|, |M_+(\boldsymbol{d})|\big) \leq (m,i)$.

$Q(m,i)$**:** The strictness holds for $(J, \boldsymbol{d})$ such that $\big(|J|, |M_+(\boldsymbol{d})|\big) \lneq (m,i)$.

We have already known that $P(m,0)$ holds for any m due to Corollary 16.9. We have only to show the implication $Q(m,i) \Longrightarrow P(m,i)$ in the case $i > 0$.

Let $(J, \boldsymbol{d})$ be the tuple such that $\big(|J|, |M_+(\boldsymbol{d})|\big) = (m,i)$ such that $i > 0$. Let us pick the element $j_0 \in J$ such that $q_{j_0}(\boldsymbol{d}) > 0$. We put $I_1 := I \sqcup \{j_0\}$ and $J_1 := J - \{j_0\}$. For an element $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^I$ and a real number a, we have the naturally defined element $(\boldsymbol{c}, a) \in \boldsymbol{R}^{I_1}$. We have the naturally defined projection $\pi : \boldsymbol{R}^J \longrightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{J_1}$.

We have the induced filtration ${}^{j_0}V^{(\lambda_0)}\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}$ on ${}^{I}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{b}$. Note the following:

- We have ${}^{j_0}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{a}\,{}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{d})}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr) \simeq {}^{I_1}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{(\boldsymbol{c},a)}\,{}^{J_1}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{d})}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr)$. It is strict due to the hypothesis of the induction $Q(m,i)$.

- Let N be the real number such that $N > q_{j_0}(\boldsymbol{d})$. Then ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}-N\boldsymbol{\delta}_{j_0}}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr)$ is strict, due to the hypothesis of the induction $Q(m,i)$.

Then the strictness of $(J,\boldsymbol{d})$ follows easily. Thus we obtain Lemma 16.23. ∎

Corollary 16.10 *Let b be a negative number. Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$, and $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. Then the sheaf ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr)$ is strict.*

Proof We put $J := \underline{n} - I$. Since ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr)$ is the inductive limit of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\bigl(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\bigr)$ $(\boldsymbol{d}\in\boldsymbol{R}^J)$. Thus the corollary follows from Lemma 16.23. ∎

Corollary 16.11 *Let b be a negative number. The sheaf $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ is strict.*

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 16.10. ∎

Proposition 16.3 *Let b be any real number. The sheaf $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ is strict.*

Proof In the case $b<0$, we have already shown the claim in Corollary 16.11. Let us consider the case $b=0$. Then we have the injection $t:\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_0\longrightarrow\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{-1}$ (Corollary 16.1). Thus the strictness of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_0$ follows.

Let us consider the following claims:

$P(a)$**:** The strictness of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ holds for any $b\leq a$.

$Q(a)$**:** The strictness of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ holds for any $b<a$.

We have already shown that $P(0)$. Since the set $\{a\mid\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_a\neq0\}$ is discrete, we have only to show the implication $Q(a)\Longrightarrow P(a)$ in the case $a>0$, which we will show in the following.

Let us consider the following morphisms:

$$\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a-1}\xrightarrow{\ \eth_t\ }\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a}\xrightarrow{\ t\ }\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a-1}. \tag{344}$$

By our construction of the filtration $U^{(\lambda_0)}$, the morphism $\eth_t$ is surjective. Let us consider the composite, which is the endomorphism of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a-1}$ induced by the multiplication of $\eth_t\cdot t=t\cdot\eth_t+\lambda$ from the right. Due to Lemma 16.10, we have $F_{a-1}(t\cdot\eth_t)=F_a(\eth_t\cdot t)=0$ on $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a-1}$. Here F_a is given in (327). Note that $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ does not vanish identically, if we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=a>0$. Since $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{a-1}$ is strict due to our assumption $Q(a)$, the composite of the morphisms in (344) is injective. Thus the morphism $\eth_t$ is isomorphic. It means the strictness of $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_a$. Namely the claim $P(a)$ holds, and thus the proof of Proposition 16.3 is accomplished. ∎

Recall that the the following endomorphism identically vanishes on $\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b$ for any b:

$$\prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)}\bigl(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^N.$$

Here N denotes a sufficiently large integer. Recall that we put as follows for any element $u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)$:

$$\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])=\mathrm{Ker}\bigl(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^N.$$

Corollary 16.12 *We have the following:*

1. *The sheaf $\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is strict for any u.*

2. *The morphism $t:\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\longrightarrow\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is injective, and it is isomorphic in the cases*

   (a) $\mathfrak{p}(u) < 0$.

   (b) $\mathfrak{p}(u) = 0$ *and* $u \neq (0,0)$.

3. *The morphism* $\eth_t : \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]) \longrightarrow \psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{t,u+\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ *is isomorphic in the cases*

   (a) $\mathfrak{p}(u) > -1$.

   (b) $\mathfrak{p}(u) = -1$ *and* $u \neq (-1,0)$.

   If we have $\mathfrak{p}(u) < -1$, *the morphism* $\eth_t$ *is injective. If we have* $u = (-1,0)$, *then the morphism* $\eth_t$ *is surjective.* ■

In particular, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 16.4 *The sheaf* $\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ *is strictly* S*-decomposable along* $t = 0$. ■

16.5 The decomposition

16.5.1 The endomorphisms of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ and ${}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$

Let pick an element $i \in \underline{n}$. In the following, we put $m_i = 0$ if $i > l$. We see the action of s_i on ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$, which is induced by the multiplication from the right. Assume $b := \mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u) < 0$ and $c \leq 0$. A section of ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ can be described as a sum of sections of the form $(f \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ such that $q_i(\boldsymbol{n}) = 0$, where $f \in {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{c+b\cdot m_i}\mathfrak{E}$. We have the following formula:

$$(f \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot s_i = (fs_i \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}} - m_i \cdot (f \otimes s^{h+1})\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

We put as follows:

$$g_{1\,i}\big((f \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}\big) := fs_i \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}},$$

$$g_{2\,i}\big((f \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}\big) := (f \otimes s^h\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}})s_i$$

$$g_{s}\big((f \otimes s^h)\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}\big) := f \otimes s^{h+1}\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}}.$$

In the case $i > l$, we have $g_{1\,i} = g_{2\,i}$.

Lemma 16.24 *We have* $g_{2\,i} = g_{1\,i} - m_i \cdot g_s$. *The morphisms* $g_{2\,i}$, $g_{1\,i}$ *and* g_s *commute.*

Proof The first claim is clear from the definition. The commutativity of $g_{2\,i}$ and g_s are easy to see. Since $g_{1\,i}$ can be described as a linear combination of $g_{2\,i}$ and g_s, we obtain the second claim. ■

Lemma 16.25 *On* ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$, *we have the following vanishing for any sufficiently large integer* N*:*

$$\prod_{u_1 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},i,\lambda_0,c+m_ib)} \big(g_{1\,i} + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)\big)^N = 0, \qquad \big(g_s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)^N = 0.$$

Proof For any section f of ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{c+m_ib}(\mathfrak{E})$, we have the following:

$$f \cdot \prod_{u_1 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},i,\lambda_0,c+m_ib)} (t \cdot \eth_t + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1))^N \in {}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c+m_ib}(\mathfrak{E}).$$

It means the first vanishing. The second vanishing follows from the definition of $\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$. ■

We put as follows:

$$G_{i,c,N}(x) := \prod_{u_1 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},i,\lambda_0,c+m_ib)} \big(x + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_1 - m_iu)\big)^N.$$

Here x denotes a variable.

Lemma 16.26 *For a sufficiently large N, we have $G_{i,c,N}(g_{2\,i})=0$ on ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$:*

Proof We have the equality $g_{2\,i}+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1-m_iu)=g_{1\,i}+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)-m_i\cdot\big(g_s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\big)$. In the case $c\leq 0$, we obtain $G_{i,c,N}(g_{2\,i})$ by the equality above and Lemma 16.25. Since we have the surjection $\eth_t^M : {}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c-M}\longrightarrow {}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}$ and the relation $G_{i,c,N}(g_{2\,i})\circ\eth_i^M=\eth_i^M\circ G_{i,c-M,N}(g_{2\,i})$, the general case can be reduce to the case $c<0$. ∎

Lemma 16.27 *On ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,{}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$, we have $G_{i,c,N}(g_{2\,i})=0$ for any sufficiently large integer N:*

Proof It follows from Lemma 16.26 and the isomorphism ${}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,{}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\psi_{t,u}={}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^{i}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{c}\,\psi_{t,u}$. ∎

Corollary 16.13 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}=(c_i\,|\,i\in I)$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. On ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$, we have $G_{i,c_i,N}(g_{2\,i})=0$ for any sufficiently large integer N.* ∎

Lemma 16.28 *For any element $u_1\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},i,\lambda_0,c+m_ib)$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_1-m_iu)=c$.*

Proof It can be shown by a direct calculation. Note the equality $b=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)$. ∎

Corollary 16.14 *The $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}_I}$-module ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is strictly specializable along $z_i=0$ $(i\in\underline{n}-I)$ at λ_0. The V-filtrations at λ_0 are given by ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$.* ∎

We put $\mathcal{K}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E},i,\lambda_0,c):=\big\{u_1-m_i\cdot u\,\big|\,u_1\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E},i,\lambda_0,c+m_ib)\big\}$, where we put $b:=\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)$. For any element $\boldsymbol{c}=(c_i\,|\,i\in I)$, and for any element $\boldsymbol{u}\in\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{K}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E},i,\lambda_0,c_i)$, the submodule ${}^{I}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\big)$ of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is defined as follows, for any sufficiently large integer N:

$$
{}^{I}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\psi_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\big):=\bigcap_{i\in I}\mathrm{Ker}\big(g_{2\,i}+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,q_i(\boldsymbol{u}))\big)^N.
$$

We put as follows:

$$
\mathcal{KMS}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],i):=\big\{u_1-m_i\cdot u\,\big|\,u_1\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)\big\}.
$$

Lemma 16.29

1. *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\prod_{i\in I}\mathcal{KMS}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],i)$. Then $\big\{{}^{I}\psi^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\,\big|\,\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda\big\}$ give the $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}_I}$-module ${}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$.*
2. *Let i be an element of $\underline{n}-I$. Then ${}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]$ is strictly specializable along $z_i=0$.*
3. *Let i be an element of $\underline{n}-I$, and v be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],i)$. We put $I_1:=I\sqcup\{i\}$. We have the naturally defined element $(\boldsymbol{u},v)\in\prod_{j\in I_1}\mathcal{KMS}(\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],j)$. Then we have the following isomorphism:*

$$
\psi_{z_i,v}\,{}^{I}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]\simeq{}^{I_1}\psi_{(\boldsymbol{u},v)}\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t].
$$

Proof It can be shown by an inductive argument. ∎

16.5.2 The decompositions of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V}_{\boldsymbol{b}_I}\,{}^{J}V_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b)$

Let $I\sqcup J=\underline{n}$ be a decomposition of $\underline{n}$. We put $I_0:=I\cap\underline{l}$ and $I_1:=I-I_0$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$, we put $\boldsymbol{b}_Y:=q_Y(\boldsymbol{b})$ for $Y=I,J$. For any element $\boldsymbol{b}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $\boldsymbol{b}_J<0$, we put ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{b},b}:={}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}_I}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\big(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\big)$. We have the right action of s_i $(i\in I)$. We put $\tilde{s}_i:=m_i^{-1}\cdot s_i$ for $i\in I_0$. We would like to see the generalized eigen decomposition of ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{b},b}:={}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}_I}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}_J}\big(\Psi^{(\lambda_0)}_b\big)$ with respect to the actions of $\tilde{s}_i$ $(i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)))$.

We have the following isomorphism (Proposition 16.2):

$$
{}^{I}\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{b},b}\simeq\frac{{}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}_I,\,\boldsymbol{b}_J+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}_J\big)[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))}(s-\tilde{s}_i^{\circ})}\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{b}_I)}.
$$

Here the action of $\tilde{s}_i^{\circ}$ on ${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)+b\boldsymbol{m}_I,\,\boldsymbol{b}_J+b\boldsymbol{m}_J\big)[s]$ is induced by the action of $\tilde{s}_i$ on ${}^{I}T^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)+b\boldsymbol{m}_I,\,\boldsymbol{b}_J+b\boldsymbol{m}_J\big)$. We use a similar convention in the following.

Remark 16.2 *The actions of $\tilde{s}_i$ and $\tilde{s}_i^\circ$ are different. The relation is $\tilde{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i^\circ - s$.* ■

On ${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I) + b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}_I, \boldsymbol{b}_J + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\big)$, we have the action of the tuple of endomorphisms

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{s}} := \big(\widetilde{s}_i \,\big|\, i \in I_0\big).$$

We have the generalized eigen decomposition:

$${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I) + b\boldsymbol{m}_I, \boldsymbol{b}_J + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\big) := \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})} \mathbb{E}\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{s}},\ -\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\big).$$

Here we put $S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m}) := \big\{\big(u_i \,\big|\, i\in I_0\big) \,\big|\, m_i\cdot u_i \in \mathcal{K}\big(\mathcal{E},\lambda_0,i,b\cdot m_i + q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))\big)\big\}$.

We put $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m}) := \mathbb{E}\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{s}},\ -\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\big)$, and then we have the following decomposition:

$${}^IT^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I) + b\boldsymbol{m}_I, \boldsymbol{b}_J + b\boldsymbol{m}_J\big) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})} \mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m}).$$

Then we obtain the following decomposition:

$${}^I\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{b},b} \simeq \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})} \frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ)}\cdot \eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{b}_I)}. \tag{345}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_i \,|\, i\in I_0)$ be an element of $S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})$. Since we have $q_i(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)) = 0$ for any elements $i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))$, we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i) = b$ for $i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))$. Thus, if we have $\mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u_i) = \mathfrak{e}(\lambda_0,u_j)$ $\big(i,j\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))\big)$, then we obtain $u_i = u_j$. We also remark that we have $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u_i)\neq b$ for any $i\in I_0 - M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))$. We obtain the decomposition of $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))$ as follows:

$$M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)) = \coprod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)} M(\boldsymbol{u},u), \qquad M(\boldsymbol{u},u) := \big\{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)) \,\big|\, u_i = u\big\} = \big\{i\in I_0 \,\big|\, u_i = u\big\}. \tag{346}$$

Corresponding to the decomposition (346), we have the following:

$$\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ) = \prod_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)}\ \prod_{i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ).$$

Then we have the following isomorphism:

$$\frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ)} \simeq \bigoplus_{u\in\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)} \frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ)}.$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u) := \frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[s]}{\prod_{i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)}(s-\tilde{s}_i^\circ)}$$

Then the eigenvalue of the action s on $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$, and the eigenvalue of $\tilde{s}_j^\circ = m_j^{-1}\cdot g_{1\,j}$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_j)$. Note that the eigen functions of $m_i^{-1}\cdot g_{1\,i}$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ for any $i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)$. We put $N := s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ and $\tilde{N}_i := \tilde{s}_i + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ for $i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)$. Then we have the following:

$$\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u) \simeq \frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[N]}{\prod_{i\in M(\boldsymbol{u},u)}(N-\tilde{N}_i)}. \tag{347}$$

We obtain the decomposition, as follows:

$${}^I\mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{b},b} \simeq \bigoplus_{(u,\boldsymbol{u})} \mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{b}_I)}. \tag{348}$$

Here $(u,\boldsymbol{u})$ runs through the set $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t],\lambda_0,b)\times S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})$. We also have the decomposition:

$${}^I\operatorname{Gr}^V_{\boldsymbol{b}_1}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{b}_2}\psi_u^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t]) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in S(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I),b,\boldsymbol{m})} \mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},u,\boldsymbol{m})\cdot\eth_z^{\vartheta(\boldsymbol{b}_I)}. \tag{349}$$

Let us consider the action of $\tilde{s}_i$ $(i\in I_0)$ on $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$. Recall that we have the relation $\tilde{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i^\circ - s$.

Lemma 16.30

- *Let i be an element of I_0. The eigenvalue of $\tilde{s}_i$ on $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i-u)$.*
- *The decompositions* (348) *and* (349) *are generalized eigen decompositions with respect to the endomorphism $\tilde{s}_i$ $(i\in I_0)$ and s.*

Proof The second claim immediately follows from the first claim. The eigenvalue of s is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$ and the eigenvalue of $\tilde{s}_i^{\circ}$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)$. Thus we obtain the first claim. ∎

Corollary 16.15 *Let i be an element of $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}))$. Then $\tilde{s}_i$ is nilpotent on $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ if and only if i is contained in $M(\boldsymbol{u},u)$.* ∎

16.5.3 The decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$

Recall we put $I_0=I\cap\underline{l}$ and $I_1=I-I_0$. We assume that $\boldsymbol{b}_I\leq 0$. From our construction, $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})$ is a subbundle of ${}^{I}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{b}_I+b\cdot\boldsymbol{m}_I}\,{}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<\boldsymbol{b}_J+b\boldsymbol{m}_J}({}^{\square}\mathcal{E})$ over $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Moreover, they are contained in the $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})$-part $\mathbb{E}\bigl(\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}},-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$, in the generalized eigen decomposition with respect to the tuple of the morphisms $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}=\bigl(\tilde{s}_i\bigm| i\in M(\boldsymbol{b}_I)\bigr)$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$ denote the nilpotent part of $\tilde{s}_i$ on $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}},-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u}))$.

We also have the action of s_i $(i\in I_1)$ on $\mathbb{E}\bigl(\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}},-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})\bigr)$. We denote the nilpotent part of s_i by $\mathcal{N}_i$. We put $R(\boldsymbol{u}):=\{i\in I_1\,|\,u_i=(0,0)\}\subset I_1$. Then we have $s_i=\mathcal{N}_i$ for $i\in R(\boldsymbol{u})$. We put $\mathcal{N}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}:=\prod_{i\in R(\boldsymbol{u})}\mathcal{N}_i$.

Lemma 16.31 *We have $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})=\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}$.*

Proof It can be directly checked by our construction, by using Lemma 15.33. ∎

Let j be an element of $R(\boldsymbol{u})$. Note $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m})\simeq\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{N}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})-\{j\}}$. Then the naturally defined morphism $z_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m})$ is isomorphic to the natural inclusion. The naturally defined morphism $\eth_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m})\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})$ is isomorphic to the morphism $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_j$. Then we obtain the naturally induced morphisms, for any element $j\in R(\boldsymbol{u})$:

$$z_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m},u),\quad \eth_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m},u)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u).$$

Let j be an element of $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I))\subset I_0$. Note that the multiplication $\cdot z_j$ from the right induces the isomorphism $\phi:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m})$. Then we obtain the following isomorphism:

$$\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m},u)\simeq\frac{\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m})[N]}{\prod_{i\in M'(\boldsymbol{u},u)}(N-N_i).}\tag{350}$$

Here we put $M'(\boldsymbol{u},u):=M(\boldsymbol{u},u)-\{j\}$. Under the isomorphism (350), the morphism $z_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ is induced by the identity of $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)[N]$.

Lemma 16.32 *The morphism $\eth_j:\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_j,\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j},\boldsymbol{m},u)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ is induced by the morphism $m_j\cdot(\tilde{N}_j-N)$ on $\mathcal{Q}(I,\boldsymbol{b},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)[N]$.*

Proof Let $\sum_{j=1}^{h}\phi(f_i)\cdot N^i$ be a section of the right hand side of the isomorphism (350). We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigl(\sum_{j=1}^{h}\phi(f_i)\cdot N^i\Bigr)\cdot\eth_j=\Bigl(\sum_{j=1}^{h}f_i\cdot N^i\Bigr)\cdot s_j=\sum_{j=1}^{h}(f_i\cdot s_j)\cdot N^i-m_j\cdot\sum_{j=1}^{h}f_i\cdot N^i\cdot s\\ =\sum_{j=1}^{h}f_i\cdot(s_j-m_j\cdot s)\cdot N^i=m_j\sum_{j=1}^{h}f_i\cdot(\tilde{N}_j-N)\cdot N^i.\end{aligned}\tag{351}$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Lemma 16.33 *Assume that $\boldsymbol{b}_I \leq 0$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_J < 0$. Let i be an element of $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)) \cup R(\boldsymbol{u})$. Then we have the following decomposition:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\big(\mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u)\big) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i).$$

Proof It follows from Proposition 12.3. ▮

Let j be an element of I_1. Then we have the induced morphism:

$$\eth_j : \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_j, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j}, \boldsymbol{m}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}). \tag{352}$$

Lemma 16.34 *In the case $q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) > 0$, the morphism* (352) *is isomorphic. Thus the induced morphism $\eth_j : \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_j, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j}, \boldsymbol{m}, u) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u)$ is isomorphic.*

Proof It is clear from our construction. ▮

Lemma 16.35 *Let j be an element of I_0. Assume that $q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) > 0$. Then we have $\mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}) = \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_j, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j}, \boldsymbol{m})$ and $\mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u) = \mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_j, \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,j}, \boldsymbol{m}, u)$.*

Proof In the case $q_j(\boldsymbol{b}) > 0$, we have $\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I) = \varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I - \boldsymbol{\delta}_j)$. Then the lemma is clear from our construction. ▮

Proposition 16.5 *Assume $\boldsymbol{b}_J < 0$. Let i be an element of $M(\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I)) \cup R(\boldsymbol{u})$. Then we have the following decomposition:*

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\big(\mathcal{Q}(I, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u)\big) = \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i).$$

Proof We have already checked such decomposition in the case $\boldsymbol{b}_I \leq 0$. By using the isomorphisms given in Lemma 16.34 and Lemma 16.35, the general case can be reduced to the case $\boldsymbol{b}_I \leq 0$. ▮

16.5.4 The special case

Let us consider the case $l = n$, $I = \underline{n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = 0$. In the case we have $\varpi(\boldsymbol{b}_I) = 0 = \vartheta(\boldsymbol{b}_I)$. We also have the following:

$$S(0, b, \boldsymbol{m}) = \big\{\big(u_i \,\big|\, i \in \boldsymbol{n}\big) \,\big|\, m_i \cdot u_i \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, \lambda_0, i, b \cdot m_i)\big\}.$$

Then we have the following decomposition:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\big(\psi_{t,u}\big) = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u} \in S(0,b,\boldsymbol{m})} \mathcal{Q}\big(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, m\big), \quad \mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u) = \frac{\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m})[N]}{\prod_{i \in M(\boldsymbol{u}, u)}(N - \tilde{N}_i)}.$$

Lemma 16.36 *The endomorphism $\tilde{s}_i$ on $\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u)$ is nilpotent for any $i \in \underline{n}$, if and only if $u_i = u$ holds for any $i \in \underline{n}$.*

Proof It follows from Corollary 16.15. ▮

Let us consider the case $\boldsymbol{u} = \big(\overbrace{u, \ldots, u}^{n}\big)$. We put $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \big(m_i \cdot u \,\big|\, i \in \underline{n}\big) + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}} \in (\boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C})^n$. Note that $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$.

Lemma 16.37 *We have the natural isomorphism: $\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}) \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$. (See the subsubsection* 8.9.1 *for ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$).*

Proof It can be checked directly from the definitions. ▮

Hence we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u) \simeq \mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}\big(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)\big)_{|\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}.$$

See the subsubsection 3.9.2 for $\mathcal{V}_{\underline{n}}\big(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)\big)$. In particular, we obtain the subbundle:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda} \subset P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n}, 0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{m}, u).$$

17 The weight filtration on $\psi_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}$ and the induced $\mathcal{R}$-triple

In this section, we use the right $\mathcal{R}$-module structure.

17.1 The weight filtration on ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$

17.1.1 ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$ and the filtrations ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}$

In this subsection, $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])$ is often denoted by $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}$, for simplicity. We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}ar_{b\cdot m_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr):=\bigl\{\alpha-b\cdot m_i\,\big|\,\alpha\in\mathcal{P}ar(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i)\bigr\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}ar^{-}_{b\cdot m_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr):=\bigl\{r\in\mathcal{P}ar_{b\cdot m_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr)\,\big|\,r<0\bigr\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr):=\bigl\{r\in\mathcal{P}ar_{b\cdot m_i}\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},i\bigr)\,\big|\,r\geq 0\bigr\}.$$

We put as follows, for any subset $I\subset\underline{n}$:

$${}^{I}\mathcal{L}:={}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})\Big/\sum_{I'\supsetneq I}{}^{I'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}).$$

Then ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_J(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$-sheaf, where we put $J:=\underline{n}-I$. For any element $\boldsymbol{a}\in\boldsymbol{R}^n$, we put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl({}^{I}\mathcal{L}\bigr):=\mathrm{Im}\Bigl({}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})\cap{}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})\longrightarrow{}^{I}\mathcal{L}\Bigr).$$

Then ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl({}^{I}\mathcal{L}\bigr)$ is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_J(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$-sheaf.

Lemma 17.1

- *Let j be an element of $\underline{n}-I$. In the case $a_j<0$, we have ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}({}^{I}\mathcal{L})=0$.*
- *Let j be an element of I. In the case $a_j\geq 0$, we put as follows:*

$$a'_i:=\begin{cases}a_i & (i\neq j)\\ \max\mathcal{P}ar^{-}_{b\cdot m_j}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},j), & (i=j).\end{cases}$$

Then we have ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}'}({}^{I}\mathcal{L})={}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}({}^{I}\mathcal{L})$.

Proof The claims are clear from our construction of ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})$. ▮

Let π denote the projection ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})\longrightarrow{}^{I}\mathcal{L}$. For any section f of ${}^{I}\mathcal{L}$, we take a section F of ${}^{I}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})$ such that $\pi(F)=f$.

Lemma 17.2

- *The set ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f):={}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(F)\cap\bigl(\boldsymbol{R}^{I}_{<0}\times\boldsymbol{R}^{J}_{\geq 0}\bigr)$ is canonically determined for f.*
- *For any element $\boldsymbol{a}\in{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)$, the section $P_{\boldsymbol{a}}(f):=P_{\boldsymbol{a}}(F)$ of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})$ is canonically determined for f.*

Proof Since we have $F-F'\in\sum_{I'\supsetneq I}{}^{I'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})$ for other choice of F', the claims are clear. ▮

Let S be a subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. We put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S}({}^{I}\mathcal{L}):=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\bigl({}^{I}\mathcal{L}\bigr).$$

Lemma 17.3 *The projection* $\pi : {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \longrightarrow {}^I\mathcal{L}$ *induces the surjection:*

$$
{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \cap {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big).
$$

Proof It follows from ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \cap {}^I V_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \cap {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})$. ∎

Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{n}$ be a decomposition.

Corollary 17.1 *Let f be a section of ${}^I\mathcal{L}$. Then f is contained in ${}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ if and only if ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}(S)$.* ∎

17.1.2 Local freeness

Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{n}$ be a decomposition.

Corollary 17.2 *Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I_{<0}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{\geq 0}$. Then we have the naturally defined isomorphism:*

$$
{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \simeq {}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L}).
$$

In particular, ${}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ is coherent and locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_J}$-module.

Proof We have the naturally defined morphism from the left hand side to the right hand side. By using Lemma 17.3, we can check that the morphism is isomorphic. The local freeness follows from the result in the subsubsection 16.5.2. ∎

Lemma 17.4 *Let S be a primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{\geq 0}$. The $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_J}$-module ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_S {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ is locally free and coherent.*

Proof We have only to check the claims for primitive subsets S, which are contained in $\prod_{j\in J}\mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j)$. For such a primitive subset S, we put as follows:

$$
r(S) := \max\big\{|\boldsymbol{c}| \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{c}\in S\big\}.
$$

Here we put $|\boldsymbol{a}| = \sum a_i$. We use an induction on the number $r(S)$.

We have the following exact sequence for some $S' \subset \prod_{j\in J}\mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j)$:

$$
0 \longrightarrow {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) \longrightarrow {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{353}
$$

Then we have $r(S') < r(S)$. Due to the hypothesis of the induction, we may assume that ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ is locally free and coherent. The third term in the sequence (353) is locally free due to Corollary 17.2. Then we obtain the local freeness of ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$. ∎

Corollary 17.3 *The $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_J}$-module ${}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ is locally free of infinite rank.* ∎

17.1.3 Filtrations ${}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the compatibility

Let K be a subset of $\underline{n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^K$. We put as follows:

$$
{}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) := \bigcup_{q_K(\boldsymbol{a})=\boldsymbol{b}} {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big).
$$

In particular, we put ${}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}_b := {}^{\{i\}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_b$.

Let S be a finite subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^K$. We put as follows:

$$
{}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big).
$$

Lemma 17.5

- *The projection* $\pi : {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0} \longrightarrow {}^I\mathcal{L}$ *induces the surjection:*

$$ {}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \cap {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}) \longrightarrow {}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big). $$

- *Let* f *be a section of* ${}^I\mathcal{L}$*. Then* f *is contained in* ${}^K V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ *if and only if* $q_K\big({}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Prim}(f)\big)$ *is contained in* $\mathcal{S}(S)$*.* ▮

We have the filtrations $\big({}^j V^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, j \in J\big)$ on ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_s {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ in the category of the vector bundles.

Lemma 17.6 *The tuple of the filtrations* $\big({}^j V^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, j \in J\big)$ *is compatible in the sense of Definition* 4.7*.*

Proof From the proof of Lemma 17.4, we have the equality:

$$ \sum \mathrm{rank}\, {}^J \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) = \mathrm{rank}\, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_S {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big). $$

From Lemma 17.5, we have the following:

$$ \bigcap_{j\in J} {}^j V^{(\lambda_0)}_{c_j} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) = {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big). $$

Then we obtain the compatibility by using Lemma 4.2. ▮

17.1.4 The actions of $g_{1,i}$ and the generic splitting

On ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_S {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ and ${}^J \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$, we have the action of the tuple $\big(g_{1,i} \,\big|\, i \in J\big)$, given in the subsubsection 16.5.1.

Lemma 17.7 *The following endomorphism vanishes on* ${}^J \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$*:*

$$ \prod_{u_1 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}, i, \lambda_0, c_i + m_i b)} \big(g_{1,i} + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_1)\big)^N. $$

Proof It follows from Lemma 16.25 and Corollary 17.2. ▮

Lemma 17.8 *Let* $\lambda_1 \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ *be generic, and* ϵ_1 *be a positive number such that* $\Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1) \subset \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ *and that any* $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_1, \epsilon_1)$ *is generic. Let us consider the endomorphisms of* $\big(g_{1,i} \,\big|\, i \in J\big)$ *on* ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_S {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}$*. Then the generalized eigen decomposition for* $\big(g_{1,i} \,\big|\, i \in J\big)$ *gives the splitting of the filtrations* $\big({}^i V^{(\lambda_0)} \,\big|\, i \in J\big)$*.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 17.7. ▮

17.1.5 The weight filtration of $N = s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$

We put $s := t \cdot \eth_t$ and $N := s + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$. Since the eigenfunction of s on $\psi_{t,u}$ is $-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$, the induced actions of N are nilpotent on the vector bundles ${}^I\mathcal{L}$, ${}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_S {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$ and ${}^J \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$.

Lemma 17.9 *The conjugacy classes of* N *on* ${}^J \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)_{|(\lambda,P)}$ *are independent of a choice of* $(\lambda, P) \in \mathcal{D}_J(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$*.*

Proof Recall the descriptions in the subsubsection 16.5.2. Then the independence of λ follows from the limiting mixed twistor theorem. When we fix a generic λ, we can show the independence of P by using the normalizing frame. Thus we obtain the independence of (λ, P). ▮

Corollary 17.4 *The weight filtration* $W\big(N,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{c}}\,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)$ *is a filtration in the category of vector bundles.* ∎

Lemma 17.10 *Let us consider the action of* N *on* ${}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})$*.*

- *The conjugacy classes of* N *on* ${}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})_{|(\lambda,P)}$ *are independent of a choice of* $(\lambda,P)\in\mathcal{D}_J(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$*.*
- *The filtration* $W\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)$ *is a filtration in the category of vector bundles.*
- *The projection* ${}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\longrightarrow{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_S\,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ *induces the surjective morphism:*
$$W\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)\longrightarrow W\big(N,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_S\,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big).$$
- *In the case* $S\subset\mathcal{S}(S')$*, we have the following equality:*
$$W\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)=W\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)\cap{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L}).$$

Proof Let us see the first claim. The independence of λ for a fixed P can be shown by using the generic splitting (Lemma 17.8), Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 17.9. The independence of P for a fixed generic λ can be shown by using the normalizing frame. Thus we obtain the first claim.

The other claims can be shown similarly. ∎

Lemma 17.11 *We have the following:*
$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}W_h\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)=W_h\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big).\tag{354}$$

Proof We have only to check the claims for primitive subsets S, which are contained in $\prod_{j\in J}\mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0},j)$. For such a primitive subset S, we put as follows:
$$r(S):=\max\big\{|\boldsymbol{c}|\,\big|\,\boldsymbol{c}\in S\big\}.$$
Here we put $|\boldsymbol{a}|=\sum a_i$. We use an induction on the number $r(S)$. The left hand side and the right hand side of (354) are denoted by $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ respectively.

Let us consider the exact sequence:
$$0\longrightarrow{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\longrightarrow{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\xrightarrow{\pi_S}\bigoplus\nolimits_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\longrightarrow 0$$
Here we have $r(S')<r(S)$.

Due to Lemma 17.10, we have the following:
$$\pi_S(\mathcal{A})=\pi_S(\mathcal{B})=\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}W_h\big(N,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big).$$

We also obtain the following, due to Lemma 17.10:
$$\operatorname{Ker}\pi_S\cap\mathcal{B}=W_h\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big).\tag{355}$$

We have the following for $\operatorname{Ker}\pi_S\cap\mathcal{A}$:
$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Ker}\pi_S\cap\mathcal{A}&=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}\Big(W_h\big(N,{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)\cap{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\Big)\\&=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}\Big(W_h\big(N,{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big)\cap{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\cap{}^JV^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}{}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})\Big).\end{aligned}\tag{356}$$

The following lemma can be easily shown.

Lemma 17.12 *We have the subset* $S(\boldsymbol{a}) \subset \prod_j \mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j)$ *satisfying the following:*

$$\mathcal{S}(S(\boldsymbol{a})) \cap \prod_{j\in J} \mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j\big) = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) \cap \mathcal{S}(S') \cap \prod_{j\in J} \mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j\big).$$

We also have the following:

$$\mathcal{S}\Big(\bigcup_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} S(\boldsymbol{a}')\Big) \cap \prod_{j\in J} \mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j\big) = \mathcal{S}(S') \cap \prod_{j\in J} \mathcal{P}ar^{\geq 0}_{b\cdot m_j}\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}, j\big).$$

▮

Then the right hand side of (356) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}\Big(W_h(N, {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}({}^I\mathcal{L})) \cap {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S(\boldsymbol{a})}{}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)\Big). \tag{357}$$

Since we have $r(S(\boldsymbol{a})) < r(S)$, (357) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S}\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S(\boldsymbol{a})} W_h\big(N, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)\big) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{c}\in S'} W_h\big(N, {}^J V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}{}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{b}}\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)\big). \tag{358}$$

Since $r(S') < r(S)$, the right hand sides of (358) and (355) are same. Then we obtain $\operatorname{Ker}\pi_S \cap \mathcal{A} = \operatorname{Ker}\pi_S \cap \mathcal{B}$. Thus we obtain $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$. ▮

17.1.6 The decomposition

We reformulate the result in the subsubsection 16.5.3.

Let S be a primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. Let i be an element of $\underline{n}$. Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$ such that $i \in I$. We put $J' := (\underline{n} - I) \cup \{i\}$. We have the $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}_{J'}}$-locally free sheaf ${}^i\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1}\, {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big)$. We also have the following direct summand:

$${}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) := \mathbb{E}\big(z_i\eth_i, -1\big).$$

We put $I' := I - \{i\}$. Note we have $J' \sqcup I' = \underline{n}$. We put $S' := \big\{\boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_i \,\big|\, \boldsymbol{a} \in S\big\}$. Then we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}'_J}$-locally free sheaf ${}^i\operatorname{Gr}_0\, {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}({}^{I'}\mathcal{L})$. We also have the following direct summand:

$${}^i\psi_0{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}\big({}^{I'}\mathcal{L}\big) := \mathbb{E}\big(z_i\eth_i, 0\big).$$

The multiplication z_i induces the morphism:

$$\operatorname{var}_i : P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}\big({}^{I'}\mathcal{L}\big) \longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_{-1}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big).$$

The multiplication of $\eth_i$ induces the morphism:

$$\operatorname{can}_i : P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_{-1}{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big({}^I\mathcal{L}\big) \longrightarrow P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}\big({}^{I'}\mathcal{L}\big).$$

Lemma 17.13 *We have the decomposition:*

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0{}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}\big({}^{I'}\mathcal{L}\big) = \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{can}_i) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{var}_i).$$

Proof When we take the ${}^{J'}\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}$, the result follows from Lemma 16.33. Then we obtain the result by using the generic splitting (Lemma 17.8) and Lemma 5.8. ▮

Corollary 17.5 *We have the decomposition:*

$$P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0({}^I\mathcal{L}) = \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{can}_i) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}\operatorname{var}_i .$$

In particular, $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{can}_i)$ *and* $\operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{var}_i)$ *are subbundles of* $P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0({}^I\mathcal{L})$ *on* $\mathcal{D}_{J'}$. ▮

Corollary 17.6 $\operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{var}_i)$ *is a subbundle of* $P_h\operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ *on* $\mathcal{D}_{J'}$. ▮

17.2 The filtration $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$

17.2.1 Preliminary

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category. Let C be an object of $\mathcal{A}$, and let $f : C \longrightarrow C$ be a nilpotent endomorphism of C. Recall that we obtain the weight filtration $W(f)$, characterized by the following conditions (see (1.6) in [13]):

- $f\big(W_h(f)\big) \subset W_{h-2}(f)$.
- The induced morphism $f^h : \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(f)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^{W(f)}$ is isomorphic for any $h \geq 0$.

The weight filtration has a functoriality.

Lemma 17.14 *Let C_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be objects of $\mathcal{A}$. Let f_i be nilpotent endomorphisms of C_i. Let $\phi : C_1 \longrightarrow C_2$ be a morphism such that the following diagramm is commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
C_1 \arrow[r, "\phi"] \arrow[d, "f_1"'] & C_2 \arrow[d, "f_2"'] \\
C_1 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & C_2.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then the morphism ϕ preserves the weight filtrations, i.e., $\phi\big(W_h(f_1)\big) \subset \phi\big(W_h(f_2)\big)$

Proof Assume that $f_1^{d+1} = f_2^{d+1} = 0$. Recall that we have $W_d(f_i) = C_i$, $W_{d-1}(f_i) = \mathrm{Ker}(f_i^d)$, $W_{-d} = \mathrm{Im}(f_i^d)$ and $W_{-d-1} = 0$. Then it is easy to see that W_d and W_{-d} are preserved by ϕ. Then it is easy to derive that ϕ preserves W_h for any h. (See the way of the recursive construction of the weight filtration in (1.6) in [13].) ▮

Let $0 \longrightarrow C_1 \xrightarrow{a} C_2 \xrightarrow{b} C_3 \longrightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence in the abelian category $\mathcal{A}$. Let f_i be nilpotent endomorphisms of C_i. Let $W(C_i)$ be the filtrations of C_i which are preserved by the morphisms a and b. Moreover we assume that the induced sequence $0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_3) \longrightarrow 0$ is exact, i.e., the morphisms a and b are strict with respect to the filtrations.

Lemma 17.15 *Let i be either 1 or 3. We put $S := \{1, 2, 3\} - \{i\}$. Assume that $W(C_j)$ are the weight filtrations of f_j for $j \in S$. Then $W(C_i)$ is also the weight filtration of f_i for i.*

Proof We have only to show that $W(C_i)$ satisfies the axioms of the weight filtration. Since $f_2\big(W_h(C_2)\big) \subset W_{h-2}(C_2)$, we obtain $f_i\big(W_h(C_i)\big) \subset W_{h-2}(C_i)$. Due to the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^W(C_3) \longrightarrow 0$, we obtain that the morphisms $f_i^h : \mathrm{Gr}_h^W(C_i) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{-h}^W(C_i)$ are isomorphic for any h. ▮

Let $0 \longrightarrow C_1 \xrightarrow{a} C_2 \xrightarrow{b} C_3 \longrightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence in the abelian category $\mathcal{A}$. Let f_i be nilpotent endomorphisms of C_i.

Corollary 17.7

- *If the morphism a is strict with respect to the filtrations $W(f_1)$ and $W(f_2)$, then b is also strict with respect to the filtrations $W(f_2)$ and $W(f_3)$.*
- *If the morphism b is strict with respect to the filtrations $W(f_2)$ and $W(f_3)$, then a is also strict with respect to the filtrations $W(f_1)$ and $W(f_2)$.* ▮

17.2.2 Definition of $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and the decomposition of $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}$

We introduce the filtration $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)} := \sum_{|I| \geq l-m} {}^I V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}), \qquad 0 = \mathbb{F}_0^{(\lambda_0)} \subset \mathbb{F}_1^{(\lambda_0)} \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{F}_l^{(\lambda_0)} = \psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

We put $\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)} := \psi_{t,u}/\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)}$

Lemma 17.16 *We have* $\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}} = \bigoplus_{|I|=l-m} {}^I\mathcal{L}$.

Proof We have the naturally defined surjective morphism $\bigoplus_{|I|=l-m} {}^I\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}$. Let $\big({}^If \,\big|\, |I|=l-m\big)$ be an element of $\bigoplus_{|I|=l-m} {}^I\mathcal{L}$ such that $\sum {}^If \in \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m-1}$. Then we have the following:

$$ {}^If \in \Big(\sum_{\substack{|I'|\geq l-m,\\ I'\neq I}} {}^{I'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\psi_{t,u})\Big) \cap {}^IV^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\psi_{t,u}) = \sum_{\substack{|I'|\geq l-m,\\ I'\neq I}} {}^{I\cup I'}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\psi_{t,u}). $$

If $|I'|\geq l-m$ and $I'\neq I$, then $|I\cup I'|\geq l-m+1$ and $I\cup I'\neq I$. Hence we obtain ${}^If=0$. Thus the lemma is proved. ∎

17.2.3 Compatibility of the weight filtration (I)

We put as follows:

$$ {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big) := \mathrm{Im}\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)} \cap \mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big), \qquad {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\big) := \mathrm{Im}\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\big). $$

Then we obtain the following exact sequence:

$$ 0 \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{359} $$

Lemma 17.17 *We have the following:*

$$ W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big) = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big)\big). $$

Proof Due to Lemma 17.16, we have only to show the following, for $|I|=n-m$:

$$ W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}({}^I\mathcal{L}) = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}({}^I\mathcal{L})\big). \tag{360} $$

The implication $\supset$ is clear from the functoriality of the weight filtration. Let us show the implication $\subset$. When we restrict the both sides of (360) to $\mathcal{D}_I - \bigcup_{I'\supsetneq I}\mathcal{D}_{I'}$, then the equality in (360) holds. Since the right hand side is a subbundle of ${}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}({}^I\mathcal{L})$ (Lemma 17.10), we obtain the implication $\subset$. ∎

We put as follows:

$$ W'_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big) := \mathrm{Im}\Big(W_h\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\Big). $$

Lemma 17.18 *We have* $W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})) = W'_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}))$

Proof It follows from Lemma 17.17 and Corollary 17.7. ∎

Corollary 17.8 *The projection* $\psi_{t,u} \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}$ *induces the surjection:*

$$ W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big) \longrightarrow W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big). $$

∎

Corollary 17.9 *We have the following:*

$$ W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap \mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)} = W_h\big(N, V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big). $$

Proof It follows from Lemma 17.18 and Corollary 17.7. ∎

17.2.4 The compatibility of the weight filtration (II)

Let S and S' be primitive subsets such that $S \subset \mathcal{S}(S')$. Let us consider the following diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big) \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_{m}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r, "\pi_1"] \arrow[u] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathbb{G}_{m}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & 0
\end{tikzcd} \tag{361}$$

The vertical arrows are injective.

Lemma 17.19 *We have the following:*

$$W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}) = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big).$$

Proof We use a descending induction on m. The claim in the case $m = n$ is trivial. We assume that the claim holds for m, and we will show the claim for $m-1$.

The implication $\supset$ follows from the functoriality of the weight filtration. Let us show the implication $\subset$. We have only to show the following two equalities:

$$\Big[W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\Big] \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) = W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}). \tag{362}$$

$$\pi_1\Big(W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\Big) \subset \pi_1\Big(W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}))\Big). \tag{363}$$

The equality (362) can be shown as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\Big] \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) \\
&\qquad = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) \\
&\qquad = W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}})) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) = W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}})) \\
&\qquad = W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{364}$$

The implication (363) can be shown as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_1\Big(W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\Big) \subset \pi_1\Big(W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\big)\Big) \cap \pi_1\Big({}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\Big) \\
&\qquad = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}) = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{365}$$

Thus we are done. ■

Corollary 17.10 *We have the following:*

$$W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)} = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big).$$

In particular, we have the following:

$$W_h(N, \psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)} = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big).$$

■

Lemma 17.20 *We have the following:*

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a} \in S} W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big) = W_h\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\big).$$

Proof We use a descending induction on m. In the case $m=n$, the claim is trivial. We assume that the claim for m holds, and we will prove the claim for $m-1$. We use the following exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)} \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow 0.$$

We have only to show the following two claims:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}} = W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}. \tag{366}$$

$$\pi_2\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr)\Bigr) = \pi_2\Bigl(W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr)\Bigr). \tag{367}$$

Let us show (366). We have the following:

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h(N, V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)} \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) \subset \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}$$
$$\subset W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr) \cap \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}} = W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}})\bigr). \tag{368}$$

Due to Lemma 17.11, we have already known $\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h(N, V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)} \operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}) = W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}})\bigr)$, we obtain (366).

The equality (367) can be shown as follows:

$$\pi_2\Bigl(\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)}))\Bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})) = W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr)$$
$$= \pi_2\Bigl(W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathbb{G}_m^{(\lambda_0)})\bigr)\Bigr). \tag{369}$$

Hence we are done. ▮

Corollary 17.11 *We have the following:*

$$W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr).$$

▮

Lemma 17.21 *We have the following:*

$$W_h\bigl(N, {}^{I}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr) = W_h(N, \psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^{I}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^{I}V_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N, \psi_{t,u}).$$

Proof It easily follows from Lemma 17.19 and Lemma 17.20. ▮

Lemma 17.22 *We have the following:*

$$W_h(N, \psi_{t,u}) \cap \Bigl({}^{I}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) + {}^{i}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\Bigr) = {}^{I}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N) + {}^{i}V_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)} \cap W_h(N).$$

Proof Similar to Lemma 17.21. ▮

Lemma 17.23 *Let S and S' be primitive subsets of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $S \subset \mathcal{S}(S')$. The following sequence is exact:*

$$0 \longrightarrow W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr) \longrightarrow W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr) \longrightarrow W_h\bigl(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)} / {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof We have the exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) \xrightarrow{a} {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u}) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)} / {}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{370}$$

Due to Lemma 17.21, the morphism a in (370) is strict with respect to the weight filtrations. Hence the sequence (370) is strict with respect to the weight filtrations due to Corollary 17.7. Thus we are done. ▮

17.2.5 The filtrations on $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$

We put as follows, for any $\boldsymbol{c}\in\boldsymbol{R}^I$:

$$ {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})) = \mathrm{Im}\Bigl({}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}) \Bigr). $$

We have the following isomorphism:

$$ {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})) \simeq \frac{ {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u})}{ {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}} \cap W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u})} \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h({}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{c}}). $$

We put ${}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}) := \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$.

Lemma 17.24 *The projection $W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$ induces the surjection:*

$$ {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \longrightarrow {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})). $$

Proof It follows from Lemma 17.21. ■

Lemma 17.25 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$ and i be an element of $\underline{n}-I$. We have the following:*

$$ \Bigl[{}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \cap {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c \Bigr] \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in S} {}^{I\sqcup\{i\}} V^{(\lambda_0)}_{(\boldsymbol{a},c)} \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr). $$

Proof The implication $\supset$ is clear. We show the implication $\subset$. For any section $f \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$, we pick sections $f_1 \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u})$ and $f_2 \in {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u})$ such that $\rho_h(f_1)=\rho_h(f_2)=f$. Here ρ_h denotes the projection $W_h(N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h$.

Then we have the following:

$$ \begin{aligned} f_1 - f_2 &\in W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u}) \cap \bigl({}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) + {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\psi_{t,u}) \bigr) \\ &= \bigl(W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \bigr) + \bigl(W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^i V_c(\psi_{t,u}) \bigr). \end{aligned} \tag{371} $$

Hence we obtain $f_1 - f_2 = g_1 - g_2$ for some sections $g_1 \in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u})$ and $g_2 \in {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u})$. Then we obtain the following:

$$ \begin{aligned} f_1 - g_1 = f_2 - g_2 &\in {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}) \\ &= {}^I V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}) \cap {}^i V^{(\lambda_0)}_c(\psi_{t,u}) \cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}). \end{aligned} \tag{372} $$

Then the implication $\subset$ follows easily. ■

Corollary 17.12 *Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. Let i be an element of $\underline{n}-I$ and c be a real number. We have the isomorphism: ${}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_c \,{}^I\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\boldsymbol{a}} \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}) \simeq {}^{I\sqcup\{i\}}\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{(\boldsymbol{a},c)} \,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 17.25. ■

Lemma 17.26 *Let S and S' be primitive subsets of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$ such that $S \subset \mathcal{S}(S')$. We have the following isomorphism:*

$$ \frac{ {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\bigr)}{ {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\bigr)} \simeq \mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h\Bigl({}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S'}(\psi_{t,u}) \Big/ {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{S}(\psi_{t,u}) \Bigr). \tag{373} $$

Proof The left hand side of (373) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\frac{{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big)}{{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big)} \simeq \frac{{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u})}{{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}) + W_{h-1}(N,\psi_{t,u})\cap {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})}. \tag{374}$$

On the other hand, the right hand side of (373) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\text{R.H.S.} \simeq \mathrm{Cok}\Big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\big)\Big). \tag{375}$$

We have the following commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_{h-1}(N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_{h-1}(N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W_{h-1}\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}/{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_{h}(N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_{h}(N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W_{h}\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}/{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big)/{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd} \tag{376}$$

Here we omit to denote "$\psi_{t,u}$". The first and the second rows are exact due to Lemma 17.23. The third row is exact by definition. The first and the second columns are also exact by definition. Hence we obtain the exactness of the third columns. Therefore we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\mathrm{Cok}\Big(W_{h-1}\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}/{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big) \longrightarrow W_{h}\big(N, {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}/{}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big)\Big) \simeq \mathrm{Cok}\big({}^{\underline{n}}V_{S}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V_{S'}^{(\lambda_0)}\big(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\big)\big). \tag{377}$$

The right hand side of (377) is isomorphic to the right hand side of (373) due to (375).

On the other hand, since the first and the second rows in (376) are exact, the left hand side of (377) is isomorphic to the left hand side of (373), due to (374). Thus we are done. ▮

Lemma 17.27 *Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{n}$ be a decomposition. Let $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J_{<0}$, and $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$. Then ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ is strict.*

Proof Due to Lemma 17.26, ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^J\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,{}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})$. It is strict, for $W(N)$ on ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}$ is a filtration in the category of vector bundles. ▮

Lemma 17.28 *Let $I \sqcup J = \underline{n}$ be a decomposition. Let $\boldsymbol{b}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^I$, and $\boldsymbol{c}$ be an element of $\boldsymbol{R}^J$. Then ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ is strict.*

Proof We put $M_-(\boldsymbol{c}) := \big\{i \,\big|\, c_i < 0\big\}$. Note we have $|M_-(\boldsymbol{c})| \leq n - |I|$. We use a descending induction on $(|I|, |M_-(\boldsymbol{c})|)$.

In the case $(|I|, |M_-(\boldsymbol{c})|) = (n, 0)$ or $(|I|, |M_-(\boldsymbol{c})|) = (m, n-m)$, the claim holds due to Lemma 17.27. Let us consider the case $|I| = m$ and $|M_-(\boldsymbol{c})| < n - m$. We may assume that $J = \{1, \ldots, n-m\}$ and $I = \underline{n} - J$. We may assume that $c_1 \geq 0$.

We have the filtration ${}^1V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on ${}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$. For any d, we may assume that the following is strict:

$${}^1\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\big({}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big).$$

For $d < 0$, we may assume that ${}^1V_d^{(\lambda_0)}\big({}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big)$ is strict. Then we obtain the strictness of $\big({}^I\mathrm{Gr}_{\boldsymbol{b}}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,{}^JV_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{(\lambda_0)}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big)$. ▮

Corollary 17.13 *$\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\psi_{t,u}$ and ${}^i\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\psi_{t,u}$ are strict.* ∎

Corollary 17.14 *$\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\psi_{t,u}$ is strictly specializable along $z_i=0$ for any $i=1,\ldots,n$.* ∎

17.3 Strict S-decomposability

17.3.1 Preliminary

Let m be an integer such that $0\leq m\leq n$. Let c be a real number. Let h be an integer. Let S be a primitive subset of $\boldsymbol{R}^n$. We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}(m,c,S,h):=\Bigl(\mathbb{F}_{<m}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}+\mathbb{F}_m\cap{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\Bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}),$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(m,c,S,h):=\Bigl(\mathbb{F}_{<m}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}+\mathbb{F}_m\cap{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\Bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}).$$

Lemma 17.29 *We have the following:*

$$\mathcal{A}(m,c,s,h)=W\Bigl(N,\bigl(\mathbb{F}_{<m}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}+\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\Bigr).\tag{378}$$

Proof The proof is essentially same as the arguments for Corollary 17.10. We only indicate an outline.

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{Y}:=\frac{{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}}{\bigl(\mathbb{F}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}+\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\cap V_S^{(\lambda_0)}}.$$

Then we have the following exact sequence:

$$0\longrightarrow{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigr)\longrightarrow{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Y}\longrightarrow 0.$$

By an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 17.17, we obtain the following:

$$W_h\Bigl(N,{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigr)\Bigr)=W_h\Bigl(N,{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\Bigr)\cap\Bigl({}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigr)\Bigr).$$

Then by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 17.18, we can show that the projection ${}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\longrightarrow\mathcal{Y}$ induces the surjection:

$$W_h\bigl(N,{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathbb{G}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\bigr)\longrightarrow W_h\bigl(N,\mathcal{Y}\bigr).$$

Then it immediately follows that the projection ${}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\mathcal{Y}$ induces the surjection:

$$W_h\bigl(N,{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr)\longrightarrow W_h\bigl(N,\mathcal{Y}\bigr).\tag{379}$$

Let us consider the following exact sequence:

$$0\longrightarrow\bigl(\mathbb{F}_{m-1}^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\cap\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)}\cap{}^iV_{<c}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\xrightarrow{\ a\ }{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}(\psi_{t,u})\xrightarrow{\ b\ }\mathcal{Y}\longrightarrow 0.\tag{380}$$

The surjectivity of (379) implies that the morphism b in (380) is strict with respect to the weight filtrations. Due to Corollary 17.7, the sequence (380) is strict with respect to the weight filtration. In particular, the morphism a is strict with respect to the weight filtration. Thus we obtain the equality (378). ∎

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}(m,c,S,h):=\Bigl(\mathbb{F}_m\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\Bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\cap W_h(N,\psi_{t,u}),\quad\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(m,c,S,h):\Bigl(\mathbb{F}_m\cap{}^iV_c^{(\lambda_0)}\Bigr)\cap{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\cap\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}),$$

$$\mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h):=W_h\bigl(N,{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}{}^i\mathrm{Gr}_c^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}\bigr),\qquad\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(m,c,S,h):=\mathrm{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}{}^i\mathrm{Gr}_c^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}{}^{\underline{n}}V_S^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\bigr).$$

Lemma 17.30 *The following sequence is exact:*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}(m,c,S,h) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(m,c,S,h) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof We have the following exact sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \big(\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{<m} \cap {}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}_c + \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m \cap {}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}_{<c}\big) \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m \cap {}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}_c \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \\ \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S{}^i \operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_c \operatorname{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{381}$$

Due to Lemma 17.29 and Corollary 17.7 the sequence (381) is strict with respect to the weight filtration. Due to Corollary 17.10, we have the following:

$$\mathcal{B}(m,c,S,h) = W_h\big(N, \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m \cap {}^iV^{(\lambda_0)}_c \cap {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S\big).$$

Thus we are done. ▮

Then we have the following diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}(m,c,S,h-1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{B}(m,c,S,h-1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h-1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{B}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(m,c,S,h) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd} \tag{382}$$

The first and the second rows are exact due to Lemma 17.30. The third row is exact by definition. The first and the second columns are also exact by definition. Therefore we obtain the exactness of the third columns.

Corollary 17.15 *We have the following isomorphism:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(m,c,S,h) \simeq \operatorname{Cok}\Big(\mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(m,c,S,h)\Big). \tag{383}$$

Proof It follows from the exactness of the third column in the diagramm (382). ▮

Corollary 17.16 *We have the natural isomorphism:*

$$\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m {}^i\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_c {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}) \simeq \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h \operatorname{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m {}^i\operatorname{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_c {}^{\underline{n}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_S(\psi_{t,u}). \tag{384}$$

Proof (384) is just a reformulation of (383). ▮

17.3.2 The filtrations $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ on ${}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$ and ${}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0} P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$

We have the induced filtrations $\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ on ${}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$ and ${}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0} P \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$.

Lemma 17.31 *We have the following isomorphism:*

$$\operatorname{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m {}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}) \simeq P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0 \operatorname{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m(\psi_{t,u}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=n-m,\\ i\notin I}} P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)}_h {}^i\psi_0{}^I\mathcal{L}.$$

We have the following isomorphism:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m\big({}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\big)\simeq P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h\,{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m(\psi_{t,u})=\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=n-m+1,\\ i\in I}}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h\,{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}({}^I\mathcal{L}).$$

Proof It follows from Corollary 17.16. ▮

17.3.3 The morphisms can_i and var_i

The morphisms can_i and var_i induce the following:

$$\mathrm{can}_i:\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m+1}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

$$\mathrm{var}_i:\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m+1}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

Thus we obtain the induced morphisms:

$$\mathrm{can}_i(m):\frac{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n-1}}{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m-1}}{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\frac{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n}}{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m}}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

$$\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{can}_i):\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{m+1}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

$$\mathrm{var}_i(m):\frac{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n}}{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m}}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\frac{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n-1}}{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m-1}}{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

$$\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{var}_i):\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{m+1}{}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})\longrightarrow\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_m{}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u}).$$

In the following diagramm, we omit to denote ${}^i\psi_0P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{m+1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_n/\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_m \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_n/\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m+1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{can}_i) \arrow[r, "a"] & \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i(m)) \arrow[r, "b"] & \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i(m+1)) \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{385}$$

The upper sequence is exact by definition.

Lemma 17.32 *The lower sequence is exact.*

Proof The surjectivity of b and the injectivity of a are easy. Let us show $\mathrm{Ker}(b)=\mathrm{Im}(a)$. We have only to show $\mathrm{Ker}(b)\subset\mathrm{Im}(a)$. The argument is similar to the proof of Lemma 17.17.

Recall that we have the decomposition:

$$\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{can}_i))=\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=n-m-1\\ i\notin I}}\mathcal{A}_I.$$

Here $\mathcal{A}_I$ denotes a subbundle of $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h\,{}^i\psi_0{}^I\mathcal{L}$ over $\mathcal{D}_{\underline{n}-I}$ (Corollary 17.5). It is easy to see that the restrictions of $\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{can}_i))$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i(m))$ to $\mathcal{X}-\mathcal{D}^{[m]}$ are same. Here we put $\mathcal{D}^{[m]}:=\bigcup_{|I'|=n-m}\mathcal{D}_{\underline{n}-I'}$. Thus we obtain $\mathrm{Ker}(b)\subset\mathrm{Im}(a)$. ▮

In the following diagram, we omit to denote ${}^i\psi_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_0}P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}_h(\psi_{t,u})$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Gr}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{m} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n-1}/\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m-1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{n-1}/\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{m} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, phantom, "\bigcup"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{Gr}_m(\mathrm{var}_i) \arrow[r, "a"] & \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{var}_i(m)) \arrow[r, "b"] & \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{var}_i(m+1)) \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The upper sequence is exact by definition.

Lemma 17.33 *The lower sequence is also exact.*

Proof It can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 17.32. We use Corollary 17.6 instead of Corollary 17.5. ▮

In the following diagramm, we omit to denote ${}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Gr}_{m+1}^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{F}_n^{(\lambda_0)}/\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{F}_n^{(\lambda_0)}/\mathbb{F}_{m+1}^{(\lambda_0)} \arrow[r] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Ker}\operatorname{Gr}_m(\mathrm{var}_i) \arrow[r, "a"] \arrow[u, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \operatorname{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i(m)) \arrow[r, "b"] \arrow[u, phantom, "\bigcup"] & \operatorname{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i(m+1)) \arrow[r] \arrow[u, phantom, "\bigcup"] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The upper sequence is exact by definition.

Lemma 17.34 *The lower sequence is also exact.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 17.33. ▮

Lemma 17.35 *We have the following decomposition:*

$$\frac{\mathbb{F}_n^{(\lambda_0)}}{\mathbb{F}_m^{(\lambda_0)}}\big({}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})\big) = \operatorname{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i(m)) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i(m)).$$

Proof Recall that we have the decomposition of $\operatorname{Gr}_m^{\mathbb{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}({}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}))$. (Corollary 17.5). We also have Lemma 17.32 and Lemma 17.34. Then the lemma can be shown by an easy descending induction on m. ▮

Corollary 17.17 *We have the decomposition:*

$${}^i\psi_0 P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u}) = \operatorname{Im}(\mathrm{can}_i) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(\mathrm{var}_i).$$

As a result, $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ is strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$. ▮

17.3.4 Some properties of the components

Proposition 17.1 *We have the decomposition:*

$$P_h \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)} \psi_{t,u} = \bigoplus_{I \subset \underline{n}} \mathcal{M}_I.$$

Here $\mathcal{M}_I$ denotes the $\mathcal{R}$-module satisfying the following:

- *The support of $\mathcal{M}_I$ is $\mathcal{D}_I$, we have the injection $\mathcal{M}_I \longrightarrow \iota_{I\,*}(\mathcal{M}_{I|\mathcal{D}_I^\circ})$. Here we put $\mathcal{D}_I^\circ := \mathcal{D}_I - \bigcup_{I' \supsetneq I} \mathcal{D}_{I'}$, and ι_I denotes the open immersion $\mathcal{D}_I^\circ \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_I$.*
- *$\mathcal{M}_I$ are holonomic.*
- *$\mathcal{M}_I$ are regular and strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$ for any i.*

Proof It immediately follows from Corollary 17.17 and Proposition 14.2. ▮

Lemma 17.36 *For any subset $I \subset \underline{n}$, the $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathcal{M}_I$ satisfies the conditions* 2–5 *in Proposition* 15.2.

Proof It is easy to check the conditions 2 and 3. (The condition 2 is replaced by the injectivity $\mathcal{M}_I \longrightarrow \iota_{I\,*}\big(\mathcal{M}_{I\,|\,\mathcal{D}_I^\circ}\big)$.)

Let $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ be generic. By the same argument as those in the section 15–17, we can show that $\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ is also strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. In that case, it is easy to see the specialization $\mathcal{M}_{I\,|\,\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ gives the I-component of $\operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$. Hence $\mathcal{M}_{I\,|\,\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ are also strictly S-decomposable along $z_i = 0$, i.e., the condition 4 is satisfied.

Let us check the condition 5. We put $J := \underline{n} - I$. Let us consider ${}^{I}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_I$, which is the $\mathcal{R}$-module on $\mathcal{D}_I$. Let us pick any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We denote $\mathcal{D}_I(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ by $\mathcal{D}_I$ for simplicity. Around λ_0, the sheaf ${}^{I}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_I$ is a direct summand of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\,{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\psi_{t,u})$. We have the induced filtrations ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i \in J)$ on ${}^{I}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_I$. Note that ${}^{i}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ is the V-filtration along $z_i = 0$. Since ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\,{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ is coherent and locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_I}$-module, and since ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}_I$ is a direct summand of ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\,{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$, the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}_I}$-module ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}_I$ is also coherent and locally free.

By our construction, It is easy to see that ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\,{}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$ generates ${}^{I}\,\mathrm{Gr}_0^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}\,\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}(\psi_{t,u})$. Hence we can conclude that ${}^{J}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\,{}^{I}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_I$ generate ${}^{I}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_I$. Thus we are done. ∎

17.3.5 The isomorphism

Let us see the component $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$. Since the support of $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$ is $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \{O\}$, and since $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$ is specially S-decomposable along z_i $(i \in \underline{n})$, $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$ is isomorphic to the push forward of ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$. We also have the following:

$$
{}^{\underline{n}}\psi_0\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}} \simeq \mathrm{Ker}\Bigl({}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_0\bigl(P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\bigr) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,i}}\bigl(P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}[\eth_t])\bigr)\Bigr) \tag{386}
$$

On the other hand, ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_0\bigl(P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}(\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u})\bigr)$ is naturally isomorphic to $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,\mathcal{Q}(\underline{n},0,\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{m},u)$ (see the subsubsection 16.5.4). Here we put $\boldsymbol{u} = (\overbrace{u,\ldots,u}^{n})$. We put $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,0} := \mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$.

Lemma 17.37 *We have the natural isomorphism:*

$$
\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,0} \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\psi_0\bigl(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}\bigr).
$$

Proof We have only to compare the right hand side of (386) and $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,0}$, which can be checked directly from the definitions. ∎

18 The sesqui-linear pairings

In this section, we use the left $\mathcal{R}$-module structure on $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$.

18.1 The sesqui-linear pairing on $\mathfrak{C}$

18.1.1 The pairing on $\mathcal{E}$ and the prolongation

We put $X := \Delta^n$, $D_i := \{z_i = 0\}$ and $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} D_i$. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X - D$. Let us recall the sesqui-linear pairing $C_0 : \mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{Db}_X^{\boldsymbol{A}}$ given by Sabbah. Let f be a section of $\mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ and g be a section of $\mathcal{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}$. Then the pairing is defined as follows:

$$
C_0(f,\bar{g}) := h\bigl(f, \sigma^*(g)\bigr). \tag{387}
$$

We prolong it to the sesqui-linear pairing $\mathfrak{C}$ for the $\mathcal{R}$-module $\mathfrak{E}$. We have only to consider the pairings of the sections of $\mathfrak{E}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}}$.

Let f be a section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)$ and g be a section of $V^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{<0}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}\bigr)$. Then we have the following estimate of C^∞-functions on $(X - D) \times \Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, for some positive constants C and ϵ:

$$
\bigl|h\bigl(f,\sigma^*(g)\bigr)\bigr| \leq C \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} |z_i|^{-2+\epsilon}.
$$

Thus the functions $h\bigl(f,\sigma^*(g)\bigr)$ is an L^1-function with respect to the standard metric $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |dz_i \cdot d\bar{z}_i|$. Hence $h\bigl(f,\sigma^*(g)\bigr)$ naturally gives a distribution. We denote it by $\mathfrak{C}(f,\bar{g})$.

For an element $\boldsymbol{p}=(p_1,\ldots,p_n)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, we denote $\prod_{i=1}^n \eth_i^{p_i}$ by $\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{p}}$. Let us consider sections of the form $\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_1}\cdot f$ and $\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_2}\cdot g$, where f and g are sections of $V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)$ and $V_{<0}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}\bigr)$ respectively, and $\boldsymbol{n}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{n}_2$ be elements of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. (Note we use the left $\mathcal{R}$-modules in this subsection.) Since $\mathfrak{C}(f,g)$ gives a distribution on X, we obtain the following distribution:

$$\mathfrak{C}\bigl(\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_1}\cdot f,\ \overline{\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_2}\cdot g}\bigr):=\eth_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_1}\cdot\overline{\eth}_z^{\boldsymbol{n}_2}\cdot\mathfrak{C}(f,\bar{g}). \tag{388}$$

Since $\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}$ are generated by $V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr)$ and $V_{<0}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}\bigl(\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}\bigr)$, the formula (388) gives the pairing $\mathfrak{C}$ of $\mathfrak{E}$.

18.1.2 The uniqueness

Let $C:\mathfrak{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}\otimes\overline{\mathfrak{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}_X$ be a sesqui-linear pairing.

Lemma 18.1 *Assume that C vanishes on $X-D$. Then it vanishes on X.*

Proof Similar to the proof of Proposition 14.3. ▮

Corollary 18.1 *Let C' be a pairing of $\mathfrak{E}$. Assume that the restriction of C' to $X-D$ coincides with C_0 given by Sabbah* (387)*. Then C' is same as $\mathfrak{C}$ given in the subsubsection* 18.1.1.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 18.1. ▮

18.2 The sesqui-linear pairing on ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$

18.2.1 The definition of ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$. We put as follows:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E}):={}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\,{}^{\underline{n}}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})).$$

It is easy to see that we have the globally defined flat bundle ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ on $(X-D)\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*$ satisfying the following:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times(X-D)}={}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times(X-D)}.$$

Remark 18.1 *Note that ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is not same as ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1}$ which is defined for $\boldsymbol{u}_1\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$ (the subsubsection* 10.2.2*). Let $\pi:\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})\longrightarrow\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$ be the projection. Then we have the following relation:*

$${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,|\,(X-D)\times\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda^*}={}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{u})}. \tag{389}$$

▮

18.2.2 Some vanishing

Let s_i and $\bar{s}_i$ denote the left action of $-\eth_i\cdot z_i$ and $-\overline{\eth}_i\cdot\bar{z}_i$ $(i=1,\ldots,n)$ respectively. Let us pick sections f_1 of $\mathfrak{E}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}$ and f_2 of $\mathfrak{E}_{|\sigma(\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0))}$ satisfying $\bigl(s_i+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_a)\bigr)^N\cdot f_a=0$ for some $u_a\in\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)$ $(a=1,2)$ and for some sufficiently large integer N. Note that we also have $(\bar{s}_2+\overline{\sigma^*\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_2)})^N\cdot\bar{f}_2=0$.

We put $F:=\mathfrak{C}(f_1,\overline{f_2})$. We have the following:

$$\Bigl(-\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}z_i+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^N F=0. \tag{390}$$

$$\Bigl(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{z}_i}\bar{z}_i+\sigma^*\Bigl(\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_2)}{\lambda}\Bigr)\Bigr)^N F=0. \tag{391}$$

From the equality (390), F is of the following form:

$$F = z_i^{\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)-1} \cdot \sum_k a_k \cdot (\log z_i)^k.$$

Here we have $\partial a_k/\partial z_i = 0$.

From the formula (391), we obtain the following:

$$\Bigl(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i}\bar{z}_i + \frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_2)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^N F = 0. \tag{392}$$

Here we have used the equalities:

$$\sigma^*(\lambda) = -\lambda^{-1}, \quad \sigma^*\overline{\Bigl(\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Bigr)} = \frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}.$$

The equation (392) implies that F is of the following form:

$$F = \bar{z}_i^{\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_2)-1} \cdot \sum_k b_k \cdot (\log \bar{z}_i)^k.$$

Here we have $\partial b_k/\partial \bar{z}_i = 0$.

Lemma 18.2 *Assume that F is not 0. Then we have $u_1 = u_2 + b\cdot(1,0)$ for some integer b, and F is of the following form on $\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$:*

$$F = |z_i|^{2\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)-2} \cdot \bar{z}_i^{-b} \cdot \Bigl(\sum_k a_k \cdot \bigl(\log|z_i|^2\bigr)^k\Bigr).$$

Here a_k are independent of the variables z_i and $\bar{z}_i$, and we put $u = u_1$.

Proof Note that F is a C^∞-function on $X-D$. In particular, it is not multi-valued. It implies that $\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_1)-\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_2)$ is a integer. It implies $u_1 - u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}\times\{0\}$. Thus we obtain the first claim. The second claim also follows from the uni-valuedness of F. ▮

18.2.3 The filtration and the decomposition

Let $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ be generic. Recall that we have the generalized eigen decomposition with respect to the monodromy actions, for some small positive number ϵ_0:

$$\mathcal{E}_{|(X-D)\times\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)} = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})} \mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}.$$

Here $\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}$ denotes the generalized eigen space corresponding to $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda,\boldsymbol{u})$.

Lemma 18.3 *Let U denote the disc $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. The restriction of the sesqui-linear pairing C_0 to $\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}_1\,U}^{(\lambda_0)} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{u}_2\,\sigma(U)}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}}$ is trivial unless $\boldsymbol{u}_1 = \boldsymbol{u}_2$.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 18.2. ▮

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, which is not necessarily generic. For a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0, we have the filtrations ${}^i\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i \in \underline{n})$ and the decomposition ${}^i\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}$ $(i\in\underline{n})$ of $\mathcal{E}_{|\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)\times(X-D)}$. We may assume that any point $\lambda\in\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ is generic.

Lemma 18.4 *Let U denote the disc $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_i)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_i)$ be elements of $\boldsymbol{C}^{*\,n}$. The restriction of the sesqui-linear pairing C_0 to $\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \otimes \overline{\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta})}$ is trivial unless $\alpha_i = \bar{\beta}_i^{-1}$ for any i.*

Proof Let λ_1 be any point of $\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$, and ϵ_1 be a positive number such that $U_1:=\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)\subset\Delta^*(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. Then we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})_{|U_1\times(X-D)}=\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})\\ \mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_1)}_{\boldsymbol{u}},\quad \mathbb{E}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{|\sigma(U_1)\times(X-D)}=\bigoplus_{\substack{\boldsymbol{u}\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})\\ \mathfrak{e}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),\boldsymbol{u})=\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\mathcal{E}^{(\sigma(\lambda_1))}_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

In the case $\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}_1)\neq\overline{\mathfrak{e}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),\boldsymbol{u}_2)}^{-1}$, we have $\boldsymbol{u}_1\neq\boldsymbol{u}_2$. Hence we obtain the vanishing on U_1 due to Lemma 18.3. Then we obtain the vanishing on U by using the argument given in the last part of Lemma 18.1. ▮

Let us consider the set $S(\alpha):=\bigl\{u\in\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,i)\bigm|\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,u)=\alpha\bigr\}$. We have the two maps

$$\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0):S(\alpha)\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R},\quad \mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\sigma(\lambda_0)\bigr):S(\alpha)\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{R}.$$

Lemma 18.5 *Let u_1 and u_2 be elements of $S(\alpha)$. Then we have $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_1)>\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_2)$ if and only if we have $\mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\sigma(\lambda_0),u_1\bigr)<\mathfrak{p}^f\bigl(\sigma(\lambda_0),u_2\bigr)$.*

Proof It can be checked by a direct calculation. ▮

Lemma 18.6 *Let u be an element of $S(\alpha)$ above. We put $x:=\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u)$. Let us consider the restriction of C_0 to the following:*

$$^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{x}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\otimes\overline{^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{y}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta})}.\tag{393}$$

Here we assume $\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{-1}$.

In the case $y<\mathfrak{p}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),u)$, then the restriction of C_0 to (393) is 0.

Proof Let us take $U_1=\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_1)$ as in the proof of Lemma 18.4. We have the following decompositions:

$$^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{x}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})_{|U_1\times(X-D)}=\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,q_i(\boldsymbol{u}'))\leq x}\mathcal{E}^{(\lambda_1)}_{\boldsymbol{u}'},\qquad {}^{i}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{y}\mathbb{E}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{|\sigma(U_1)\times(X-D)}=\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),q_i(\boldsymbol{u}'))\leq y}\mathcal{E}^{(\sigma(\lambda_1))}_{\boldsymbol{u}'}.$$

In the case $\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u_1)\leq\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,u)$ and $\mathfrak{p}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),u_2)\leq y<\mathfrak{p}^f(\sigma(\lambda_0),u)$, we have $u_1\neq u_2$ due to Lemma 18.5. Then we obtain the vanishing as in the proof of Lemma 18.4. ▮

Lemma 18.7 *The pairing $C_0:\mathcal{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}\otimes\overline{\mathcal{E}}_{\boldsymbol{A}}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}^{\boldsymbol{A}}_{X-D}$ induces the pairing*

$$C_0:{}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,\boldsymbol{A}}\otimes\overline{{}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}\,\boldsymbol{A}}}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}^{\boldsymbol{A}}_{X-D}.\tag{394}$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 18.4. (See the subsubsection 18.2.1 for the definition of ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$.) ▮

18.2.4 In the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})<\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{n}}$ and $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0),\boldsymbol{u})<\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{n}}$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$. Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}$. We denote a small disc $\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$ by U.

Let F and G be sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathcal{E})$ over $X\times U$ and $X\times\sigma(U)$ respectively. Recall we have the relation (389). Thus we can naturally regard F and G as sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{u})}(\mathcal{E})$ over $(X-D)\times U$ and $(X-D)\times\sigma(U)$ respectively. Here π denotes the natural projection $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})\longrightarrow\overline{\mathcal{KMS}}(\mathcal{E}^0,\underline{n})$. Hence we have the pairing $C_0(F,G)$, which gives an element of $C^\infty(X-D,\mathcal{O}(U))$.

On the other hand, we can take the section $\tilde{F}$ of $\mathcal{E}_{|(X-D)\times U}$ such that $\pi_1(\tilde{F})=F$. Here π_1 denotes the following projection:

$$\pi_1:{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u}))\longrightarrow{}^{\underline{n}}\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}^{(\lambda_0)}}_{\mathfrak{p}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\mathbb{E}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathfrak{e}^f(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})).$$

We can pick $\tilde{F}$ such as it is the section of ${}^{\square}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})}\mathcal{E}_{|X\times U}$. (See the subsubsection 10.2.2). In the case $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})<\boldsymbol{\delta}$, $\tilde{F}$ naturally gives the section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{n}}}(\mathfrak{E})_{|X\times U}$.

Similarly we can pick a section $\tilde{G}$ of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0),\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\underline{n}}}(\mathfrak{E})_{|X\times\sigma(U)}$ for G.

Lemma 18.8 *$C_0(F,G)$ naturally gives the $\mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$-valued distribution Φ on X, and we have $\Phi=\mathfrak{C}(\tilde{F},\tilde{G})$.*

Proof It is clear from the definitions of $\mathfrak{C}(\tilde{F},\tilde{G})$. ▮

18.3 The induced sesqui-linear pairings

18.3.1 The induced sesqui-linear pairing on ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$. We put $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}$. Let f be sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)(\boldsymbol{A})$. We have the sections F of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})_{|X\times\boldsymbol{A}}$ satisfying the following:

- We have $F_{|\{O\}\times\boldsymbol{A}} = f$ under the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})_{\{O\}\times\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda^*}} \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)_{|\boldsymbol{C}^*_{\lambda}}$.
- We have the following vanishing, for any i and for any sufficiently large integer N:

$$\Big(-\eth_i z_i + \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i)\Big)^N F = 0.$$

The section F is called the lift of f.

Let f and g be sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$ over $\boldsymbol{A}$. Let F and G be the lifts of f and G respectively. We can naturally regard F and G as the sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{u}})}(\mathcal{E})$ over $(X-D)\times\boldsymbol{A}$. Thus we have the pairing $C_0(F,G)$.

Lemma 18.9 *The function $C_0(F,G)$ is of the following form:*

$$C_0(F,G) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |z_i|^{2\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)-2} \cdot \Big(\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^n_{\geq 0}} a_{\boldsymbol{n}}(\lambda)\cdot\prod_i \big(\log|z_i|^2\big)^{n_i}\Big). \tag{395}$$

Here $a_{\boldsymbol{n}}(\lambda)$ denote holomorphic functions on $\boldsymbol{A}$.

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 18.2. ▮

Definition 18.1 *We put as follows:*

$${}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(C_0)(f,g) := a_0.$$

Here a_0 is given in the development (395). *Thus we obtain the sesqui-linear pairing:*

$${}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(C_0) : {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{{}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)_{\boldsymbol{A}}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

▮

Let N be any integer. The multiplication of $(\prod_{i=1}^n z_i)^N$ induces the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}}(E)$.

Lemma 18.10 *Under the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E) \longrightarrow {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}-N\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}}(E)$ above, we have ${}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(C_0) = {}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}-N\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}}(C_0)$.*

Proof It is clear from the definition. ▮

18.3.2 Comparison of the induced sesqui-linear pairings

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, \underline{n})$ such that any i-th components are not contained in $\mathbb{Z}\times\{0\}$. We put $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}$. We have the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$ by definition (see the subsubsection 15.3.3). Thus we obtain the following sesqui-linear pairing:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(C_0) : {}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{{}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{\boldsymbol{A}}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

On the other hand, we have the following pairing, due to Lemma 15.48:

$${}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{C}) : {}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{\boldsymbol{A}} \otimes \overline{{}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})_{\boldsymbol{A}}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

Proposition 18.1 *We have ${}^{\underline{n}}\tilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{C}) = {}^{\underline{n}}\Psi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(C_0)$.*

Proof We have only to compare them on a neighbourhood of any point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{A}$. Due to Lemma 18.10 and the definition of ${}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}}\mathfrak{C}$, we may assume $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0, \boldsymbol{u}) < 0$ and $\mathfrak{p}(\sigma(\lambda_0), \boldsymbol{u}) < 0$.

Let U denote a small disc $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Let f and g be sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E})$ on U and $\sigma(U)$ respectively. Let F and G be the lifts of f and g in the sense of the subsubsection 18.3.1. Due to Lemma 18.8, Lemma 18.9 and Definition 18.1, the proposition can be reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 18.11 *We have* ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{C}(f, \bar{g}) = a_0$. *Here* a_0 *is given in the development* (395).

Proof By the definition of ${}^{\underline{n}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{C}$, we have the following:

$$ {}^{\underline{n}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{C}(f, \bar{g}) = \mathrm{Res}_{s_1+\alpha(\lambda,u_1)} \mathrm{Res}_{s_2+\alpha(\lambda,u_2)} \cdots \mathrm{Res}_{s_n+\alpha(\lambda,u_n)} \Big\langle \mathfrak{C}(F, \bar{G}), \chi \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} |z_i|^{2s_i} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} dz_i \wedge d\bar{z}_i \Big\rangle \qquad (396) $$

Here we put $\alpha(\lambda, u_i) := \lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i)$, and χ denotes a C^∞-function on $\boldsymbol{C}^n$ as follows:

Condition 18.1

- *The support of* χ *is compact.*
- χ *is identically* 1 *around the origin.*
- χ *depends only on* $|z_i|$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$.

Then Lemma 18.11 can be reduced to the following lemma.

Lemma 18.12 *We have the following formula:*

$$ \mathrm{Res}_{s+\alpha(\lambda,u)} \int \chi \cdot |z|^{s+2\alpha(\lambda,u)-2} \cdot (\log|z|^2)^m \cdot \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} dz \wedge d\bar{z} = \begin{cases} 1 & (m = 0) \\ 0 & (m \neq 0). \end{cases} \qquad (397) $$

Here we put $\alpha(\lambda, u) := \mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u)$ *for* $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \boldsymbol{C}$, *and* χ *denotes a* C^∞*-function on* $\boldsymbol{C}^1$ *as in Condition* 18.1.

Proof We put $T := s + \alpha(\lambda, u)$, the left hand side of (397) can be rewritten as follows:

$$ \mathrm{Res}_{T=0} \int \chi \cdot |z|^{2T-2} \cdot (\log|z|^2)^m \cdot \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} dz \wedge d\bar{z}. $$

Then we obtain the formula (397) from Corollary 2.4. Thus we obtain Lemma 18.12, Lemma 18.11 and thus Proposition 18.1. ∎

18.4 A comparison of the induced objects

18.4.1 Preliminary

Let V be a vector bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$, and let $S : V \otimes \sigma(V) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$ is a perfect symmetric pairing. Since it is symmetric, it satisfies $\sigma^* S(f, \sigma^*(g)) = S(g, \sigma^*(f))$. We have the perfect strict $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\Theta(V^\vee) = \big(V_0, \sigma^*(V_\infty^\vee), C_V\big)$ (the subsubsection 3.10.1). The perfect pairing $S : V_0 \otimes \sigma^*(V_\infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}$, induces the isomorphism $\rho_2 : \sigma^*(V_\infty^\vee) \longrightarrow V_0$.

Lemma 18.13 *For any* $F \in V_0(\boldsymbol{A})$ *and for any* $G \in \sigma(V_\infty^\vee)(\boldsymbol{A})$, *we have the following:*

$$ C_V(F, \bar{G}) = S(F, \sigma^* \rho_2(G)). $$

Proof Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the pairing of the vector bundle and its dual. We have the following equalities:

$$C_V(F, \bar{G}) = \langle F, \sigma^* G \rangle = \sigma^* \langle \sigma^* F, G \rangle = \sigma^* S\big(\rho_2(G), \sigma^* F\big) = S(F, \sigma^* \rho_2(G)).$$

Thus we are done. ∎

For sections $F, G \in V_0(\boldsymbol{A})$, we put $C_S(F, \bar{G}) := S(F, \sigma^* G)$, which gives the pairing $V_0(\boldsymbol{A}) \otimes \overline{V_0(\boldsymbol{A})} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{A})$. Thus we obtain the perfect $\mathcal{R}$-triple (V_0, V_0, C_S). The isomorphism $\rho_2 : \sigma^*(V_\infty^\vee) \simeq V_0$ induces the isomorphism $\Theta(V^\vee) \simeq (V_0, V_0, C_S)$, due to Lemma 18.13.

We have the isomorphism $f_S : V^\vee \longrightarrow \sigma^*\big(V^\vee\big)$ induced by S. It induces the isomorphism $\Theta(f_S) : \Theta(V^\vee) \simeq \Theta\big(\sigma^*\big(V^\vee\big)\big) \simeq \Theta(V^\vee)^*$. We also have the natural morphism $g_S : (V_0, V_0, C_S) \longrightarrow (V_0, V_0, C_S)^* = (V_0, V_0, C_S)$. The following lemma is clear from our construction.

Lemma 18.14 *Under the isomorphism* $\Theta\big(V^\vee\big) \simeq (V_0, V_0, C_S)$, *we have* $\Theta(f_S) = g_S$. ∎

18.4.2 The $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\Theta\big(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{-\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)\big)$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be an element of $\prod_i \mathcal{KMS}(\mathcal{E}^0, i)$ such that any i-th component is not contained in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\}$. For simplicity we put $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}} := \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}$. Applying the construction in the subsubsection 18.4.1 for $V = S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$ and the pairing $S : S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E) \otimes \sigma^* S^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}(0)$, we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\Theta\big(S^{\mathrm{can}}_{-\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E^\vee)\big) \simeq \big({}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E), {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E), C_S\big).$$

Here C_S can be calculated as follows: Let f and g be sections of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$ and ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$. We take the corresponding multi-valued holomorphic sections F_0 and G_0 of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})$ and ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})$, namely, we have $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(F_0) = f$ and $\Phi^{\mathrm{can}}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(G_0) = g$.

Lemma 18.15 *We have* $C_S(f, \bar{g}) = h(F_0, \sigma^* G_0)$. *Here* h *denotes the hermitian metric of the given tame harmonic bundle* $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$.

Proof It is clear from our construction. See Lemma 18.13. ∎

18.4.3 The isomorphism

Since we have the isomorphism ${}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\mathfrak{E}) \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$ (the subsubsection 15.3.3), we would like to compare the sesqui-linear pairings and the polarizations under the isomorphism.

Lemma 18.16 *We have* $C_S(f, \bar{g}) = {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}^{(\lambda_0)}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathfrak{C}(f, \bar{g})$.

Proof We have the formula of the following form:

$$F = \prod_{i=1}^{n} z_i^{-\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i) - 1}\Big(F_0 + \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \neq 0} F_{\boldsymbol{n}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \big(\log z_i\big)^{n_i}\Big)$$

$$G = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \bar{z}_i^{-\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda, u_i) - 1}\Big(G_0 + \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \neq 0} G_{\boldsymbol{n}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \big(\log \bar{z}_i\big)^{n_i}\Big).$$

Here $F_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ and $G_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ denote multi-valued flat sections. Then the term a_0 in the development (395) is $h(F_0, \sigma^* G_0)$. Thus we are done. ∎

Corollary 18.2 *We have the isomorphism* $\Theta\big(S_{-\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E^\vee)\big) \simeq {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\big(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{C}\big)$, *which induces the isomorphism of the polarized mixed twistor structure.* ∎

Corollary 18.3 *We have* $S(f, \sigma^* g) = {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathfrak{C}(f, \bar{g})$. ∎

18.5 The specialization of the pairings

This subsection is a continuation of the subsubsection 17.3.5.

18.5.1 Preliminary

Let us calculate the induced sesqui-linear pairing $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)$ on the component $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$ of $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\,\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}[\eth_t]$ (see the subsubsection 17.3.5). We would like to show that the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\bigl(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}},\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}},\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^h\otimes\mathrm{id}\bigr)\bigr)$ is a polarized pure twistor structure of weight h in the sense of Sabbah. (Note the support is $\{O\}$ in this case.) Since $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}}$ is isomorphic to the push-forward of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,0}:=\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,|\,\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda}$ (Lemma 17.37), we calculate the sesqui-linear pairings of the sections of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}\,0}$. We would like to use Lemma 12.37 and Lemma 3.101.

Remark 18.2 In Lemma 12.37, the result is stated for our polarized mixed twistor structure. In particular, the nilpotent maps are obtained from the residues $\mathrm{Res}_i(\mathbb{D})$ there. In this section, we use the nilpotent parts of the left action of $-\eth_i z_i$. Hence the signatures are reversed. ▮

We put as follows:

$$L_k(z):=\frac{\bigl(\log|z|^2\bigr)^k}{k!}.$$

Let f be a section of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}}(\boldsymbol{A})$ and g be a section of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}}(\boldsymbol{A})$. We denote the nilpotent part of $-\eth_t t$ by N. We denote the nilpotent part of $-\eth_i z_i$ by N_i. We also denote the nilpotent part of $m_i^{-1}(-\eth_i z_i)$ by $\tilde{N}_i$.

We have the description $f=\sum_{a=0}^{n-1}(\sqrt{-1}N)^a f_a$ and $g=\sum_{b=0}^{n-1}(-\sqrt{-1}N)^b g_b$, where f_a and g_b are sections of ${}^{\boldsymbol{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(E)$, where we put $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}=\bigl(m_i\cdot u\,\big|\,i\in\underline{n}\bigr)+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}$.

Let us consider the pairing $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^k\cdot f,\bar{g}\bigr)$. First we calculate the function on a neighbourhood of a point $\lambda_0\in\boldsymbol{A}$. We may assume that $\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)<0$. We put $u_i=m_i\cdot u$.

Let us pick a point λ_0 of $\boldsymbol{A}$. We can take the holomorphic sections F_a of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})$ $(a=0,\ldots,n-1)$, such that the following holds:

- $F_{a\,|\,\boldsymbol{A}\times\{O\}}=f_a$
- For any a and i and for sufficiently large M, $(-\eth_i z_i+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i))^M F_a=0$ holds.

(See the subsubsection 10.2.2 for ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})$).

Similarly we can pick the sections G_b of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}^{(\sigma(\lambda_0))}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}}(\mathcal{E})$ for g_b $(b=0,\ldots,n-1)$.

Note the following equality:

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^{i+k}f_i,\ \overline{(-\sqrt{-1}N)^j\cdot g_j}\bigr)=(-\lambda^2)^{-j}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^{i+j+k}\cdot f_i,\ \overline{g_j}\bigr).$$

We have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigl\langle i_+\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(\bigl(s+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^{i+j+k}\cdot F_i,\overline{G_j}\Bigr),\ |t|^{2T}\chi(t)\cdot\varphi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Bigr\rangle\\&=\Bigl\langle i_+\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(F_i,\overline{G_j}\Bigr),\ \bigl(\bigl(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^{i+j+k}|t|^{2T}\bigr)\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\varphi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Bigr\rangle+\Bigl\langle i_+\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(F_i,\overline{G_j}\Bigr),\ |t|^{2T}\cdot\chi_1(t)\cdot\varphi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Bigr\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{398}$$

Here $\chi_1(t)$ denotes a C^∞-function which vanishes identically around $t=0$. The last term is entire function of T, thus we can ignore it. We have the following (see the section 3.7 in [42]):

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigl\langle i_+\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(F_i,\overline{G_j}\Bigr),\ \bigl(\bigl(t\eth_t+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr)^{i+j+k}|t|^{2T}\bigr)\cdot\chi(t)\cdot\varphi\wedge\frac{i}{2\pi}dt\wedge d\bar{t}\Bigr\rangle\\&\qquad=\lambda^{i+j+k}\cdot\Bigl(T+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^{i+j+k}\cdot\Bigl\langle\mathfrak{C}(F_i,\overline{G_j}),\ \prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_iT}\cdot\chi\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i}\Bigr)\wedge\varphi\Bigr\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{399}$$

We may assume that $\chi\bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i}\bigr)=1$ on a neighbourhood of the support of φ. Thus we may ignore $\chi\bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i}\bigr)$ in the following.

Due to our choice of F_i and G_j, there exist holomorphic functions $a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}(\lambda)$ $\bigl(k\in\mathbb{Z},\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n}\bigr)$ such that the following holds (see Lemma 18.2):

$$\sum_{a+b=k-h}(-1)^{b}\cdot\lambda^{k-2b}\cdot\mathfrak{C}(F_a,G_b)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)-2}\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\prod_{i=1}^{n}L_{n_i}(z_i).$$

Lemma 18.17 *We have the following, for any* $\boldsymbol{l}=(l_1,\ldots,l_n)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n}$*:*

$$(-\lambda)^{|\boldsymbol{n}|}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}=\sum(-1)^{b}\cdot\lambda^{k-2b}\sum_{a+b=k}\underline{n}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(f_a\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}N_i^{n_i},\ g_b\Bigr)$$

Proof We have the following:

$$\sum_{a+b=k}(-1)^{b}\lambda^{k-2b}\cdot\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}(-\eth_i z_i+\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i))^{l_i}\cdot F_a,G_b\Bigr)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u_i)-2}\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\geq\boldsymbol{l}}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\prod_{i=1}^{n}L_{n_i-l_i}(z_i)\times(-\lambda)^{|\boldsymbol{l}|}$$

Then we obtain the result by using Corollary 2.4 inductively. ▮

Let us consider the following function:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{a,b}(-1)^{b}\cdot\lambda^{a+h-b}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^{a+b+h}\Bigl(T+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^{a+b+h}\cdot\mathfrak{C}(F_a,\overline{G_b})\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_iT}\\
&\qquad=\sum_{k}(\sqrt{-1})^{k}\Bigl(T+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^{k}\cdot\sum_{a+b=k-h}(-1)^{b}\cdot\lambda^{k-2b}\cdot\mathfrak{C}\bigl(F_a,\overline{G_b}\bigr)\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_iT}\\
&\qquad\qquad=\sum_{k}(\sqrt{-1})^{k}\Bigl(T+\frac{\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)}{\lambda}\Bigr)^{k}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i(T+\lambda^{-1}\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u))-2}\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\prod_{i=1}^{n}L_{n_k}(z_i).
\end{aligned}\tag{400}$$

We put $\tau=T+\lambda^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)$, and then the right hand side of (400) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\sum_{k}(\sqrt{-1})^{k}\cdot\tau^{k}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i\tau-2}\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}L_{n_i}(z_i).\tag{401}$$

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Bigl\langle\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^{i+k}f_i,\ \overline{(-\sqrt{-1}N)^{j}g_j}\bigr),\varphi\Bigr\rangle\\
&\qquad=\operatorname{Res}_{\tau=0}\Bigl\langle\sum_{k}(\sqrt{-1})^{k}\cdot\tau^{k}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}|z_i|^{2m_i\tau-2}\cdot L_{n_i}(z_i)\cdot\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}a_{\boldsymbol{n},k},\ \varphi\Bigr\rangle.
\end{aligned}\tag{402}$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{U}:=\Bigl\{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n}\times\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Bigm||\boldsymbol{n}|=k-n+1\Bigr\}.$$

Then the distribution in the right hand side of (402) can be regarded as the product of the delta function at $\{O\}$ and the following holomorphic function of λ (Lemma 2.19):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in\mathcal{U}} (\sqrt{-1})^k a_{\boldsymbol{n},k}\cdot(-1)^{|\boldsymbol{n}|}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n} m_i^{-n_i-1} \\
&\qquad = \prod_{i=1}^{n} m_i^{-1}\cdot(\sqrt{-1})^{n-1}\cdot\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in\mathcal{U}}\lambda^{k-|\boldsymbol{n}|}\sum_{a+b=k}(-\lambda^{-2})^b\cdot {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\sqrt{-1}\tilde{N}_i)^{n_i}\cdot f_a,\ g_b\Bigr) \\
&\qquad\qquad = \prod_{i=1}^{n} m_i^{-1}\cdot\sum_{(\boldsymbol{n},k)\in\mathcal{U}}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{n-1-2b}\cdot {}^{\underline{n}}\widetilde{\psi}_{\boldsymbol{u}}\mathfrak{C}\Bigl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}(\sqrt{-1}\tilde{N}_i)^{n_i}\cdot f_a,\ g_b\Bigr). \qquad (403)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Corollary 18.3, we obtain the following:

Lemma 18.18 *Let $f=\sum f_i\cdot(\sqrt{-1}N)^i$ and $g=\sum g_i\cdot(-\sqrt{-1}N)^j$ be sections of $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{n}}(\boldsymbol{A})$. We have the following formula:*

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^h\cdot f,\overline{g}\bigr)=\prod_{a=1}^{n} m_a^{-1}\cdot\sum_{-|\boldsymbol{n}|-n+i+j+h=-1}(\sqrt{-1}\lambda)^{n-1-2j}\cdot S\Bigl(\prod_{a=1}^{n}(\sqrt{-1}\tilde{N}_a)^{n_a} f_i,\sigma^* g_j\Bigr)$$

Here S denotes the pairing of ${}^{\underline{n}}\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,\underline{n}}}$. ∎

Corollary 18.4 *The $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}},\mathcal{M}_{\underline{n}},C')$ is the polarized pure twistor module of weight h.*

Proof It follows from Lemma 18.18, Lemma 3.101, Lemma 12.37, and Remark 18.2. ∎

18.5.2 Consequences

We have the pairing:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^h\cdot,\cdot\bigr): P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}\otimes\overline{P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}_{\boldsymbol{A}}}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{Db}_X^{\boldsymbol{A}}.$$

Let I be a subset of $\underline{n}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_I$ denote the component of $\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{E}$, whose strict support is $\mathcal{D}_I$. Let $\mathfrak{C}_I$ denote the restriction of $\mathrm{Gr}^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathfrak{C}\bigl((\sqrt{-1}N)^h\cdot,\cdot\bigr)$ to $\mathcal{M}_{I\,\boldsymbol{A}}\otimes\overline{\mathcal{M}_{I\,\boldsymbol{A}}}$. Then we obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\bigl(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I\bigr)$.

Since the support of $\mathcal{M}_I$ is $\mathcal{D}_I$, and since $\mathcal{M}_I$ is strictly S-decomposable along $z_i=0$ for any $i\in\underline{n}$, we have the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathcal{M}'_I,\mathcal{M}'_I,\mathfrak{C}_I)$ on $\mathcal{D}_I$ such that whose push out with respect to the inclusion $\mathcal{D}_I\longrightarrow\mathcal{X}$ is $(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I)$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{M}_I$ is smooth on $\mathcal{D}_I^{\circ}=\mathcal{D}_I-\bigcup_{I'\supsetneq I}\mathcal{D}_{I'}$.

Lemma 18.19 *The restriction of $(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I)$ to $\mathcal{D}_I^{\circ}$ is a variation of pure twistors of weight h.*

Proof Let q_I denote the projection of X onto D_I, and the induced projection of $\mathcal{X}$ onto $\mathcal{D}_I$. Let Q be a point of D_I°. By considering the restriction of $(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I)$ to the hyperplane $q_I^{-1}(Q)$, and by applying Corollary 18.4, we obtain the result. ∎

Then we obtain the harmonic bundle $(E_I,\overline{\partial}_{E_I},\theta_I,h_I)$ on D_I°, such that the following holds:

$$\bigl(\mathcal{E}(E_I),\mathcal{E}(E_I),C_0\bigr)\otimes\mathcal{O}(h)\simeq\bigl(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I\bigr)_{|D_I^{\circ}}.$$

Then we obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathfrak{E}(E_I),\mathfrak{E}(E_I),\mathfrak{C})$ on D_I.

Proposition 18.2 *The $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathfrak{E}(E_I),\mathfrak{E}(E_I),\mathfrak{C})\otimes\mathcal{O}(h)$ is naturally isomorphic to $(\mathcal{M}_I,\mathcal{M}_I,\mathfrak{C}_I)$.*

Proof Due to Lemma 17.36 and Proposition 15.2, $\mathfrak{E}(E_I)$ and $\mathcal{M}_I$ are naturally isomorphic. Due to Corollary 18.1, we obtain the coincidence of the sesqui-linear pairings under the isomorphism. Thus we are done. ∎

19 A prolongment as a regular pure twistor D-module

19.1 Correspondence

19.1.1 The definitions

Let X be a complex manifold and Z be an irreducible closed subset of X.

Definition 19.1 *A generically defined variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight w on Z is defined to be the data as follows:*

- *A Zariski open smooth subset U of Z.*
- *A smooth polarized pure twistor structure $\mathcal{T}$ on U. (See the section 2.2 in [42] for a smooth polarized pure twistor structure. It is equivalent to a polarized variation of pure twistor structures, given by Simpson.)*
- *There exists a resolution $\varphi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ satisfying the following:*
  - *$\tilde{D} := \varphi^{-1}(Z - U)$ is a normal crossing divisor of $\tilde{Z}$*
  - *The corresponding harmonic bundle to $\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{T}$ is tame with respect to the divisor $\tilde{D}$.*

If the corresponding harmonic bundle to $\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{T}$ is tame and pure imaginary (see [39]), then $\mathcal{T}$ is called pure imaginary. ▮

Definition 19.2 *Let $(U, \mathcal{T})$ and $(U', \mathcal{T}')$ be generically defined tame smooth pure twistor structures on Z. They are called equivalent, if there exists a generically defined tame smooth pure twistor structures $(U'', \mathcal{T}'')$ on Z satisfying $U'' \subset U \cap U'$, $\mathcal{T}_{|U''} \simeq \mathcal{T}''$ and $\mathcal{T}'_{|U''} \simeq \mathcal{T}''$.* ▮

The special case $w = 0$ is as follows.

Definition 19.3 *A generically defined tame harmonic bundle on Z is defined to be a data as follows:*

- *A Zariski open subset U of Z. It is smooth.*
- *A harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ defined on U.*
- *There exists a resolution $\varphi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ satisfying the following:*
  - *$\tilde{D} := \varphi^{-1}(Z - U)$ is a normal crossing divisor of $\tilde{Z}$*
  - *$\varphi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is a tame harmonic bundle on $\tilde{Z} - \tilde{D}$.*

If $\varphi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is tame and pure imaginary, then $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is called pure imaginary. ▮

Definition 19.4 *Let $\big(U, (E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)\big)$ and $\big(U', (E', \overline{\partial}_{E'}, h', \theta')\big)$ be generically defined tame harmonic bundles on Z. They are called equivalent if the following holds:*

- *There exists a generically defined tame harmonic bundle $\big(U'', (E'', \overline{\partial}_{E''}, h'', \theta'')\big)$ on Z satisfying the following:*

$$U'' \subset U \cap U', \quad (E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)_{|U''} = (E'', \overline{\partial}_{E''}, h'', \theta''), \quad (E', \overline{\partial}_{E'}, h', \theta')_{|U''} = (E'', \overline{\partial}_{E''}, h'', \theta'').$$

▮

19.1.2 Statement

Let $\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w)$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of generically defined tame variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight w on Z. Let $\mathrm{MPT}(Z,w)$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of polarized regular pure twistor D-module of weight w whose strict support is Z.

The following theorem is one of the main result in this paper.

Theorem 19.1 *We have the bijective correspondence* $\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w) \simeq \mathrm{MPT}(Z,w)$.

Now it is a rather formal consequence of our study. The map from $\mathrm{MPT}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w)$ is given in the subsection 19.2. The map from $\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{MPT}(Z,w)$ is given in the subsection 19.3 and the subsection 19.4. It is clear from our construction that the composite $\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{MPT}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w)$ is identity. It is shown in the subsection 19.4 that the composite $\mathrm{MPT}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z,w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{MPT}(Z,w)$ is identity.

19.2 The tameness of the corresponding harmonic bundle

19.2.1 The statement

Let X be a complex manifold, and Z be a closed irreducible subvariety of X. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a regular pure twistor D-module of weight n whose strict support is Z. Due to the result of Sabbah, we have a smooth Zariski open subset U of Z and a harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ defined on U the restriction of $\mathcal{T}$ to the open subset $X-(Z-U)$ is push-forward of $\mathcal{M}(E)\otimes\mathcal{O}(n)$, via the inclusion $U \longrightarrow X-(Z-U)$.

Proposition 19.1 *The harmonic bundle* $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ *is tame.*

The proof of Proposition 19.1 is given in the subsubsections 19.2.2–19.2.3.

19.2.2 One dimensional case

Let us consider the case $\dim Z = 1$. Let Q be a point of $Z-U$. Since the property is local, we may assume the following:

Condition 19.1

- *$X = \Delta^n$ and Z is irreducible.*
- *Let q_1 denote the projection $\Delta^n \longrightarrow \Delta$ onto the first component. We have $q_1(Q) = O$. The restriction of q_1 to Z is proper and surjective. The restriction of $q_1^{-1}(\Delta^*)\cap Z \longrightarrow \Delta^*$ is a covering map.*

Since the restriction $q_{1\,|\,Z}$ is proper, we have the push-forward $q_{1\,+}\big(\mathcal{T}\big)$, which is a regular pure twistor D-module. Let $\mathcal{T}_1 = (\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_1,C)$ denote the component of $q_{1,+}\big(\mathcal{T}\big)$ whose strict support is Δ. Then there exists the harmonic bundle $(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},\theta_1,h_1)$ on Δ^* such that the restriction $\mathcal{T}_{1\,|\,\Delta^*} \simeq \mathcal{M}(E_1)\otimes\mathcal{O}(n)$. Let us take a V-filtration of $\mathcal{M}_1$ along $z_1 = 0$ at $\lambda = 0$ on $\Delta\times\Delta(\epsilon)$ for some positive number $\epsilon > 0$. Due to the regularity, V_a is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta\times\Delta(\epsilon)}$-module for $a < 0$. We have $\eth_{z_1}\cdot V_a \subset V_{a+1}$. By considering the specialization at $\lambda = 0$, we obtain that $(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},\theta_1,h_1)$ is tame.

Let us consider the normalization $\pi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$. Then we obtain the morphism $F := q_1\circ\pi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow \Delta$. Then $F^{-1}\big(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},h_1,\theta_1\big)$ is tame. Since $\pi^{-1}\big(E,\overline{\partial}_E,h,\theta\big)$ is a direct summand of $F^{-1}\big(E_1,\overline{\partial}_{E_1},h_1,\theta_1\big)$, we can conclude that $\pi^{-1}\big(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h\big)$ is tame on $\tilde{Z}$, namely, $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ is tame.

19.2.3 The general case

Let $\pi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ be a birational morphism such that $\tilde{Z}$ is smooth and that $\tilde{D} := \pi^{-1}(Z-Z')$ is the normal crossing divisor of $\tilde{Z}$. Let C be a smooth curve in $\tilde{Z}$, which meets the smooth part of $\tilde{D}$ transversally. Then we obtain the curve $\pi(C)$ in Z. Let us specialize $\mathcal{T}$ to $\pi(C)$, which gives the pure twistor D-module $\mathcal{T}'$ whose strict support is $\pi(C)$. The restriction of $\mathcal{T}'$ to $\pi(C)\cap Z'$ corresponds to the restriction of the harmonic bundle $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{|\pi(C)\cap Z'}$. The pull back of $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{|\pi(C)\cap Z'}$ is isomorphic to the restriction $\pi^{-1}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{C\setminus\tilde{D}}$.

Then we can obtain the tameness of $\pi^{-1}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{C\setminus\tilde{D}}$, due to the result in the one dimensional case (the subsubsection 19.2.2). Then we obtain the tameness of $\pi^{-1}(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$, due to Corollary 8.1. Thus the proof of Proposition 19.1 is accomplished. ▮

19.3 The existence of the prolongment as regular pure twistor D-module

19.3.1 A prolongment of a tame variation of polarized pure twistor structure with normal crossing divisor

Let X be a complex manifold and D be a normal crossing divisor. Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X-D$. Then we have the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E},C_0)$ on $X-D$, as in the section 2.2 of [42]. Then we obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $(\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{C})$ on X. In the case $X=\Delta^n$, $D_i=\{z_i=0\}$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}D_i$, the construction of $(\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{C})$ is given in the subsection 15.2 and the subsubsection 18.1.1. The local construction can be globalized.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tame variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight w on $X-D$. Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ denote the corresponding tame harmonic bundle such that $\mathcal{T}\simeq(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E},C_0)\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(w)$. Then we have the natural prolongment $\mathfrak{T}:=(\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{C})\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(w)$.

Theorem 19.2 *The $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\mathfrak{T}=(\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{E},\mathfrak{C})\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(w)$ is a regular pure twistor D-module of weight w.*

Proof We have only to consider the case $w=0$. We use the right $\mathcal{R}$-structures. To distinguish it, we use the notation $\mathfrak{E}\otimes\omega_X$ instead of $\mathfrak{E}$, where we put $\omega_X:=\wedge^n\Omega_X^{1,0}$. So we show the following: Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over $X-D$. Then the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\mathcal{M}(E):=\big(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\omega_X,\mathfrak{E}\otimes\omega_X,\mathfrak{C}\big)$ is a regular pure twistor D-module.

We use an induction on the dimension of X. We assume that the claim has already been shown in the case $\dim(X)<n$, and we will show the claim in the case $\dim(X)=n$.

Since the property is local, we may assume $X=\Delta^n$ and $D=\bigcup_{i=1}^{n}D_i$, where $D_i=\{z_i=0\}$. Let g be a holomorphic function on X. Then we have only to show that $\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{M}(E)$ satisfies the conditions Definition 20.1 and Definition 20.2, which are Definition 4.1.2 and Definition 4.2.2 in [42].

Let $\pi:\widetilde{X}\longrightarrow X$ be a birational morphism satisfying the following:

- We put $\tilde{g}:=\pi\circ g$, and $\tilde{D}:=\pi^{-1}(D)\cup\tilde{g}^{-1}(0)$. Then $\tilde{D}$ is normal crossing.
- The restriction $\pi_{|\tilde{X}-\tilde{D}}$ gives isomorphism $\tilde{X}-\tilde{D}\longrightarrow X-\big(D\cup g^{-1}(0)\big)$.

Let $(\tilde{E},\overline{\partial}_{\tilde{E}},\tilde{h},\tilde{\theta})$ denote the pull back of $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)_{|X-\left(D\cup g^{-1}(0)\right)}$. Then we obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})=(\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}\otimes\omega_{\tilde{X}},\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}\otimes\omega_{\tilde{X}},\tilde{\mathfrak{C}})$ on $\tilde{X}$. Since $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{\tilde{g},u}\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})$ are isomorphic to the tensor product of the Tate objects and the $\mathcal{R}$-triples induced by a tame harmonic bundles (Proposition 18.2), they are regular pure twistor D-modules of weight h due to the hypothesis of the induction.

We obtain the $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\mathcal{H}^i\pi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})=(\mathcal{M}_1,\mathcal{M}_1,C)$. Due to the argument of Sabbah-Saito we know the following:

Lemma 19.1

1. *The $\mathcal{R}$-modules $\mathcal{M}_i$ are strictly S-decomposable along $g=0$, $g\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}z_i=0$, and $\prod_{i=1}^{n}z_i=0$.*
2. *The $\mathcal{R}$-triples $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{H}^i\pi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})$ are regular pure twistor D-modules with the polarization.*

Proof See the section 6.2.6 in [42]. ▮

We take the component $\mathcal{T}=(\mathcal{M}_2,\mathcal{M}_2,C)$ of $\mathcal{H}^0\pi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})$ such that $\mathcal{M}_2$ does not have non-trivial submodules whose supports are contained in $g^{-1}(0)$. Note that the regularity of $\mathcal{M}_2$ along $g=0$ follows from the regularity of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ along $\tilde{g}=0$.

Lemma 19.2 *To check $P_h\,\mathrm{Gr}_h^{W(N)}\widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{M}(E)$ satisfies the conditions in the definitions* 20.1 *and* 20.2, *we have only to show $\mathcal{T}\simeq\mathcal{M}(E)$.*

Proof It follows from the fact that $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{T}$ is a direct summand of $P_h \operatorname{Gr}^W (N)_h \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{H}^0\pi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})$. ▮

Let us show that $\mathcal{T}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}(E)$. We put $X_1 := X - \bigl(D \cup g^{-1}(0)\bigr)$. Let ι denote the open immersion $X_1 \longrightarrow X$. Then $\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are contained in $\iota_*\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_X$.

We use the following remark. We take the metric g_1 of $\Omega_X^{1,0}\bigl(\log D\bigr)$ such that $z_i^{-1} \cdot dz_i$ $(i \in \underline{n})$ are the orthonormal frame. Let Q be any point of $\tilde{X}$. We take a neighbourhood of Q and a coordinate $(\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n)$ on U such that $U \cap \tilde{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l}\bigl\{\zeta_i = 0\bigr\}$. We also take a metric g_2 of $\Omega_{\tilde{X}}^{1,0}\bigl(\log \tilde{D}\bigr)$ on U, such that $\zeta_i^{-1} \cdot d\zeta_i$ are the orthonormal frame. Then the naturally defined morphism $\pi^*\Omega_X^{1,0}(\log D) \longrightarrow \Omega_{\tilde{X}}^{1,0}(\log \tilde{D})$ is bounded on U. The metric h on E and the metrics g_a $(a = 1, 2)$ induce the metrics h_1 on $E \otimes \omega_X$ and h_2 on $\pi^*E \otimes \omega_{\tilde{X}}$ restricted to U. The naturally induced morphism $\pi^*(E \otimes \omega_X) \longrightarrow \pi^*E \otimes \omega_{\tilde{X}}$ is bounded on U.

Let $f \cdot dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n$ be a section of $\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X$. The fact $f \cdot dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n \in V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)} \otimes \omega_X$ is equivalent to the following estimate for some positive numbers ϵ and C:

$$\bigl|f \cdot dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n\bigr|_{h_1} \leq C \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} |z_i|^{\epsilon}.$$

Then we obtain the following estimate on U for some positive numbers C' and ϵ':

$$\bigl|\pi^*(f) \cdot \pi^*(dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n)\bigr|_{h_2} \leq C' \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} |\zeta_i|^{\epsilon'}.$$

It means that the restriction $\pi^*(f) \cdot \pi^*(dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n)$ to U naturally induces the section of $({}^{\underline{n}}V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}\tilde{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \omega_{\tilde{X}})_{|U}$. Hence $f \cdot dz_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz_n$ naturally induces the section of $\mathcal{M}_2$. Since $\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X$ is generated by ${}^{\underline{n}}V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X$, we obtain the inclusion $\psi : \mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X \subset \mathcal{M}_2$.

Lemma 19.3 *The restriction of the inclusion to $X - D$ is isomorphic, namely $(\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X)_{|X-D} \simeq \mathcal{M}_{2\,|\,X-D}$.*

Proof By our construction, we have $(\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X)_{|X_1} \simeq \mathcal{M}_{2\,|\,X_1}$. Hence the support of the cokernel of the morphism $(\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X)_{|X-D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{2\,|\,X-D}$ is contained in $g^{-1}(0) \cap (X - D)$. Since both of $(\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X)_{|X-D}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{2\,|\,X-D}$ are strictly S-decomposable along $g^{-1}(0) \cap (X - D)$, we obtain $(\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X)_{|X-D} \simeq \mathcal{M}_{2\,|\,X-D}$ due to Corollary 14.3. ▮

Lemma 19.4 *The inclusion $\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ is isomorphic.*

Proof Both of $\mathfrak{E} \otimes \omega_X[\eth_t]$ and $\mathcal{M}_2[\eth_t]$ are strictly S-decomposable along $\prod_{i=1}^{n} z_i$. Then we obtain the result due to Lemma 19.3 and Corollary 14.3. ▮

The coincidence of the sesqui-linear pairings are obtained by the uniqueness (Proposition 3.6.6. in [42] and Corollary 18.1 in this paper). Hence $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{M}(E)$ are isomorphic. Due to Lemma 19.2, the proof of Theorem 19.2 is accomplished. ▮

19.3.2 The existence of prolongment

Let X and Z be as in the subsection 19.1. Let $(U, \mathcal{T})$ be a generically defined variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight w. We take a resolution $\varphi : \tilde{U} \longrightarrow U$ as in Definition 19.1. Due to Theorem 19.2, we obtain the polarized regular pure twistor D-module $\mathfrak{T}'$, which is a prolongment of $\varphi^{-1}\mathcal{T}$. Let us take the component $\mathfrak{T}$ of $\mathcal{H}^0(\varphi_*\mathfrak{T}')$ whose strict support is Z, which is a polarized regular pure twistor D-module. By our construction, we have the naturally defined isomorphism $\mathfrak{T}_{|U} \simeq \mathcal{T}$, namely $\mathfrak{T}$ gives a prolongment of $\mathcal{T}$.

19.4 The uniqueness of the prolongment as regular pure twistor D-module

19.4.1 The statement of the uniqueness

Let X be a complex manifold and Z be an irreducible closed subset of X. Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', C)$ be a regular pure twistor D-module whose strict support is Z. Due to Proposition 19.1, we have a smooth Zariski open subset U of Z and a tame harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ defined over U, such that the restriction of $\mathcal{T}$ to the open subset $X - (Z - U)$ is push-forward of $\mathcal{M}(E)$ via the inclusion $U \longrightarrow X - (Z - U)$. We put $Z - U = Y$.

Let take a birational morphism $\varphi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ such that $\tilde{Z}$ is smooth and $\tilde{D} := \varphi^{-1}(Y)$ is a normal crossing divisor. We have the harmonic bundle $\varphi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, h, \theta) = (\tilde{E}, \overline{\partial}_{\tilde{E}}, \tilde{h}, \tilde{\theta})$. Then we obtain the regular pure twistor D-module $\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E}) = (\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{E}}, \tilde{\mathfrak{C}})$. We have the push-forward $\mathcal{H}^0\big(\varphi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})\big)$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}} = (\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}', \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'', \tilde{C})$ denote the component of $\mathcal{H}^0\big(\varphi_*\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E})\big)$ whose strict support is Z. We have the natural isomorphism $\mathcal{T}_{X-Y} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{X-Y}$, because both of them are push-forward of $\mathcal{M}(E)$. We would like to show that the isomorphism can be prolonged to the isomorphism of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$.

Theorem 19.3 *We have the natural isomorphism* $\mathcal{T} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$.

We will show the theorem in the following subsubsections. Before entering the proof, we give some remarks.

Since the claim is local on X, we may assume that $X = \Delta^n$. We may also assume that we have a holomorphic function g such that $Y \subset g^{-1}(0)$.

We put $\omega_U := \bigwedge^{\dim U} \Omega_U^{1,0}$. We denote the immersion $U \longrightarrow X$ by ι_U. Then $\mathcal{M}'$, $\mathcal{M}''$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}''$ are contained in $\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$, where $\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$ is regarded as the right $\mathcal{R}$-module.

Lemma 19.5 *We have only to show that* $\mathcal{M}'$ *(resp.* $\mathcal{M}''$*) and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ *(resp.* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}''$*) are same as the* $\mathcal{R}$*-submodules of* $\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$.

Proof It follows from the uniqueness of the pairing (Proposition 14.3) ▮

Lemma 19.6 *Let* $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ *be generic. We have* $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda} = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ *in* $\big(\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U\big)_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$.

Proof Both of $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ can be regarded as the regular holonomic D-modules. The restrictions to $X - Y$ is same as the push-forward of $\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\big)$. By the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence, the regular holonomic D-modules $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ correspond to the perverse sheaves $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$, and the flat bundle $(\mathcal{E}^\lambda, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f})$ corresponds to the local system L on U. Then both of $\mathcal{F}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ are the intermediate extensions of L, due to the strictly S-decomposability of $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$. Thus $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ are isomorphic. Therefore we have the isomorphism $\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda} \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$, whose restriction to to $X - Y$ can be regarded as the identity of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda \otimes \omega_U$. Hence we obtain the result. ▮

We will use the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 19.7 *Let* B *be a connected complex manifold. Let* f *be a holomorphic function on* $B \times \Delta^*$. *Assume the following:*

- *For any point* $b \in B$, *the restriction* $f_{|\{b\}\times\Delta^*}$ *is meromorphic at the origin* $\{O\}$. *In particular, we obtain the order of the pole* $p(b)$.

Then the numbers $p(b)$ *are bounded of* $b \in B$.

Proof We have the development

$$f_{|\{b\}\times\Delta^*} = \sum f_n(b) \cdot z^n.$$

The coefficients $f_n(b)$ are calculated as follows:

$$f_n(b) = \int_{|z|=1/2} z^{-n-1} \cdot f_{|\{b\}\times\{|z|=1/2\}} dz.$$

Hence the dependence of $f_n(b)$ $(n \in \mathbb{Z})$ on $b \in B$ are holomorphic. Assume that the set $S := \{n < 0 \,|\, f_n \not\equiv 0\}$ is infinite. We have $B \neq \bigcup_{n\in S} f_n^{-1}(0)$. For any point $b \in B - \bigcup_{n\in S} f_n^{-1}(0)$, the restriction of f to $\{b\} \times \Delta^*$ is transcendental, which contradicts to the assumption of the lemma. Thus the set S is finite. ▮

19.4.2 Step 1. In the case $\dim Z = 1$

We may assume that $\tilde{Z} = \Delta = \{w \,|\, |w| < 1\}$, and that $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow X = \Delta^n$ gives the homeomorphism $\tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$. We may also assume that $\varphi_n(w) = w^l$ for some integer l and that $U \simeq \tilde{Z} - \{0\} = \Delta^*$.

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We pick a frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ of $V_{<0}\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$. Each v_i naturally gives the section of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. We denote it by $\varphi_*(v_i)$. Then we obtain the submodule of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ generated by $\varphi_*\boldsymbol{v}$. We denote the submodule by $\varphi_*\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 19.8 *We have* $\varphi_*\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \mathcal{R} = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$.

Proof By definition, we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}' = R\varphi_*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes^L_{\mathcal{R}_\Delta} \varphi^{-1}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Since φ is homeomorphic, we have $R\varphi_* = \varphi_*$. Thus $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ is same as the component of $\varphi_*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes_{\mathcal{R}_\Delta} \varphi^{-1}\mathcal{R}_X)$. Thus it is generated by $\varphi_*(\boldsymbol{v})$. ∎

Lemma 19.9 *Let f be a section of $\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$. Then we have the unique description as follows:*

$$f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_{\geq 0}} v_i \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{n},i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \eth_i^{n_i}. \tag{404}$$

Here $f_{\boldsymbol{n},i}$ denote holomorphic functions on $U \simeq \Delta^*$.

Proof Note that $\partial/\partial z_1, \ldots, \partial/\partial z_{n-1}$ gives the frame of the normal bundle of U in $X - Y$. Then the claim is clear. ∎

Corollary 19.1 *The morphism $z_n^N : \iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U \longrightarrow \iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$ is injective for any positive integer N.*

Proof It is clear from the description (404). ∎

For a section f of $\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$ or $\iota_{U\,*}(\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U)_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$, we often use the notation $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}(f)$ to denote $\sum_i v_i \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{n},i}$. Here $f_{\boldsymbol{n},i}$ are given in the development (404). Then $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}(f)$ can be regarded as the holomorphic sections of $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \Omega_{\Delta^*}$ over $\Delta(\lambda, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta^*$ or Δ^*. We also note that the set $\{\boldsymbol{n} \,|\, u_{\boldsymbol{n}}(f) \neq 0\}$ is finite.

Lemma 19.10 *Let f be a section of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$, or $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$. The holomorphic functions $f_{\boldsymbol{n},i}$ on Δ^* in the development* (404) *are meromorphic at $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon) \times \{O\}$ or $\{O\}$, i.e., they are not transcendental.*

In particular, $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}(f)$ are sections of $^\square\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$ or Δ.

Proof We have $\varphi_*(\partial/\partial w) = \sum a_j \cdot \varphi^{-1}(\partial/\partial z_j)$ for holomorphic functions a_j on Δ. We have $a_n = l \cdot w^{l-1}$. Then $\varphi^{-1}(\partial/\partial z_n)$ can be described as the linear combination of $\partial/\partial w$ and $\varphi^{-1}(\partial/\partial z_j)$ $(j = 1, \ldots, n-1)$ with the meromorphic coefficients. Since we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}' = \varphi_*\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \mathcal{R}$, we obtain the result. ∎

Let us consider the V-filtrations at λ_0 of $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ along $z_n = 0$. Let us pick a section of f of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}'$.

Lemma 19.11 *For any sufficiently large integer N, the section $f \cdot z_n^N$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$.*

Proof Since f can be regarded as the section of $\iota_{U\,*}\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$, we have the development $f = \sum v_i \cdot f_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \eth_i^{n_i}$. Let $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$ be generic. Then the restriction $f_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda} = V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'_{|\mathcal{X}^\lambda}$ (Lemma 19.6). Due to Lemma 19.10, the restrictions $f_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}\,|\,\{\lambda\}\times\Delta^*}$ is meromorphic. Due to Lemma 19.7, the order of the poles are bounded independently of a choice of generic $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$. Hence we obtain some sufficiently large integer N such that $f_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot \varphi^* z_n^N$ are holomorphic on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$ for any i and $\boldsymbol{n}$, due to Hartogs' Theorem. Then we have $\sum u_{\boldsymbol{n}}(f) \cdot \varphi^* z_n^N$ are sections of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}$. In particular, we have $f \cdot \varphi(z_n^N) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes \varphi^{-1}\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence we obtain $f \cdot z_n^N \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. If we take larger N, then we may assume that $f \cdot z_n^N \in V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. ∎

Since $f \cdot z_n^N$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}' \cap V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$, we have $(f \cdot z_n^N) \cdot \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{M}' \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. The V-filtrations $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$ and $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ induce the filtrations $U^{(1)}$ and $U^{(2)}$ on $(f \cdot z_n^N) \cdot \mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 19.12 *We have* $U^{(1)} = U^{(2)}$

Proof Both of $U^{(1)}$ and $U^{(2)}$ are good and monodromic. Moreover $\mathrm{Gr}^{U^{(a)}}$ $(a = 1, 2)$ are strict. Thus we have $U^{(1)} = U^{(2)}$, due to Lemma 14.6. ▮

Lemma 19.13 *We have* $\mathcal{M}' \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$.

Proof If f is contained in $V_b^{(\lambda_0)}\mathcal{M}'$ for a negative number $b < 0$, we have $f \cdot z_n^N \in V_{b-N}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$. Due to Lemma 19.12, we have $f \cdot z_n^N \in V_{b-N}^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$. Since $z_n^N : V_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}') \longrightarrow V_{b-N}^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ are surjective for $b < 0$, we have a section $\tilde{f}$ of $V_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ such that $\tilde{f} \cdot z_n^N = f \cdot z_n^N$. Due to the injectivity of the morphism z_n^N (Corollary 19.1), we have $\tilde{f} = f$. It means that f is contained in $V_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$. Thus we obtain $V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}') \subset V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$. Since $\mathcal{M}'$ is generated by $V_{<0}^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$, we obtain Lemma 19.13. ▮

Lemma 19.14 *We have* $\mathcal{M}' = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$.

Proof Let i denote the inclusion $\mathcal{M}' \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Since i is isomorphic on $X - Y$, the support of the cokernel of i is contained in $Y = Z - U$. Thus we have $V_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}') = V_b^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ for any sufficiently negative number b. Since both of the filtrations $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$ and $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ are strictly specializable, it is easy to derive that $\mathcal{M}' = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ (Corollary 14.3). ▮

19.4.3 Step 2. In the case we have a good normal frame

We put $r := \dim X - \dim Z$. Then we can pick holomorphic functions $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ such that Z is one of the irreducible components of $\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} f_i^{-1}(0)$ with the reduced structure. We put as follows:

$$w_j := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$$

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 19.15 *There exists a Zariski open subset* U' *of* U *such that the restrictions of* $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ *to* U' *give the frame of* $N_{U'}X$. ▮

In this subsubsection, we impose the following assumption:

Condition 19.2 $U' = U$.

Under the assumption, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 19.16 *Let* f *be a section of* $\iota_{U\,*}(\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U)$. *We have the following unique description:*

$$f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} u_{\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{r} w_j^{n_j}. \tag{405}$$

Here $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ $(\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r)$ *denote holomorphic sections of* $\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U$ *on* $U \simeq \tilde{Z} - \tilde{D}$. *The set* $\{\boldsymbol{n} \,|\, u_{\boldsymbol{n}} \neq 0\}$ *is finite.* ▮

Let f be a section of $\mathcal{M}' \subset \iota_{U\,*}(\mathcal{E} \otimes \omega_U)$. We have the development of f as in (405). We may assume that there is a holomorphic function g on X such that $Z - U \subset g^{-1}(0)$, by shrinking X.

Lemma 19.17 *Let* $\tilde{C} \subset \tilde{Z}$ *be a curve transversal with the smooth part of* $\tilde{D}$. *Then the restrictions* $u_{\boldsymbol{n}\,|\tilde{C}}$ *give meromorphic sections of* $\left({}^{\square}\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \omega_{\tilde{Z}}\right)_{|\tilde{C}}$.

Proof We use an induction on the dimension of Z. The case $\dim \tilde{Z} = 1$ has been done in the Step 1 (the previous subsubsection). We assume that the claim in the case $\dim Z \leq n-1$ holds, and we will show the claim in the case $\dim Z = n$.

Let us consider the image $C = \varphi(\tilde{C}) \subset Z$. We may assume that $\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{D}$ consists of one point $\tilde{P}$. We put $P = \varphi(\tilde{P})$. In the following argument, we can shrink X if we need to do so.

We take a holomorphic function F on X such that $C \cap U$ is contained in the smooth part of $F^{-1}(0)$ and $Z \not\subset F^{-1}(0)$. Let us consider the inclusion $\iota_F : X \longrightarrow X \times \boldsymbol{C}$ of the graph, and the V-filtration $V^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\iota_F \mathcal{M}'$ along $t = 0$, where t denotes the coordinate of $\boldsymbol{C}$.

Lemma 19.18 *For any sufficiently large natural number N, the section $f \cdot g^N \otimes 1$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-1}(\iota_F \mathcal{M}')$.*

Proof It is easy to see that the restriction $f_U \otimes 1$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-1}$. Assume that $f \otimes 1$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_a(\iota_F \mathcal{M}')$ $(a > -1)$. Then it induces the sections of $\mathrm{Gr}^W \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_a(\iota_F \mathcal{M}')$, whose support is contained in $U - Z \subset g^{-1}(0)$. Hence we can kill it by multiplying the power g.

By using an inductive argument, we can take a sufficiently large number N such that $f \cdot g^N \otimes 1$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-1}$. ▮

Let Z_1 denote the irreducible component of $F^{-1}(0)$ containing C. Let $\mathcal{T}_1 = (\mathcal{M}_1', \mathcal{M}_1'', C_1)$ denote the component of $\psi_{F,-1}\mathcal{T}$ whose strict support is Z_1.

Then $f \cdot g^N$ induces the section f_1 of $\mathcal{M}_1'$, and we have $f_{1\,|\,U \cap Z_1} = (f \cdot g^N)_{|U \cap Z_1}/dF$. We have a development $f_1 = \sum u'_{\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot \prod w_j^{n_j}$, Then it is easy to see that $u_{\boldsymbol{n}\,|\,C}$ can be holomorphically reconstructed from $u'_{\boldsymbol{n}}$.

Let φ_1 denote a resolution $\widetilde{Z}_1 \longrightarrow Z_1$ such that $\widetilde{D}_1 = \widetilde{Z}_1 - \varphi_1^{-1}(Z_1 \cap U)$ is normal crossing. We have the curve $\tilde{C}_1 \subset \widetilde{Z}_1$ corresponding to C. We may assume that $\tilde{C}_1$ transversal with $\tilde{D}_1$. Due to the hypothesis of the induction, the sections $(u'_{\boldsymbol{n}\,|\,U \cap Z_1}/dF)_{|C}$ naturally give the meromorphic sections of $\left({}^{\square}\varphi_1^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \otimes \omega_{\widetilde{Z}_1}\right)_{|\tilde{C}_1}$. Then it is easy to derive that the sections $u_{\boldsymbol{n}\,|\,\tilde{C}}$ give the meromorphic sections of $\left({}^{\square}\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \omega_{\widetilde{Z}}\right)_{|\tilde{C}}$. ▮

Let us pick a point P of $\tilde{Z}$. We can take a neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $\tilde{Z}$ on which we have a coordinate $(\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n)$ such that $\mathcal{U} \cap \tilde{D} \simeq \bigcup_{i=1}^{l}\{\zeta_i = 0\}$ and $\zeta_i(P) = 0$. Such an open subset is called an admissible open set. We remark that we can consider the filtrations ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}$ on each admissible open subset. Let $\tilde{D}_{\mathcal{U},i}$ denote the component of $\mathcal{U} \cap \tilde{D}$ corresponding to $\{\zeta_i = 0\}$. Let π_i denote the projection of $\mathcal{U}$ onto $\{\zeta_i = 0\}$.

We pick a frame $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\widetilde{\mathfrak{E}}$ on $\mathcal{U}$. Let us consider the restriction of $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ to $\mathcal{U} \cap U$, where $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ are obtained in the development (405) for the section $f \in \mathcal{M}'$. Then we have the description $u_{\boldsymbol{n}} = \sum \alpha_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}} v_i$, where $\alpha_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}}$ are holomorphic on $\mathcal{U} - (\mathcal{U} \cap \tilde{D})$. Due to Lemma 19.17, the restrictions of $\alpha_{i\,\boldsymbol{n}}$ to the curves $\{\lambda\} \times \pi_p^{-1}(Q)$ are meromorphic for any point $(\lambda, Q) \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \tilde{D}^{\circ}_{p,\mathcal{U}}$. Here we put $\tilde{D}^{\circ}_{\mathcal{U},p} := \tilde{D}_{\mathcal{U},p} - \bigcup_{r \neq p}(\tilde{D}_{\mathcal{U},p} \cap \tilde{D}_{\mathcal{U},r})$. Due to Lemma 19.7, the degree ${}^{i}\deg^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}(\alpha_{j,\boldsymbol{n}})$ are bounded, independently of (λ, Q). It implies the following lemma.

Lemma 19.19 *The restrictions of $u_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ to $\mathcal{U} \cap U$ give sections of ${}^{\square}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \omega_{\widetilde{Z}}$.* ▮

We may take a finite covering of $\widetilde{Z}$ by admissible open subsets. Hence we obtain the following:

Lemma 19.20 *$u_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ give sections of ${}^{\square}\widetilde{\mathcal{E}} \otimes \omega_{\widetilde{Z}}$.* ▮

Lemma 19.21 *For any sufficiently large number N, the sections $u_{\boldsymbol{n}} \cdot g^N$ $(\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^n)$ are contained in $\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}$. Moreover they are contained in ${}^{\underline{l}}V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}(\tilde{\mathfrak{E}})$ on each admissible open subset.*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 19.20. ▮

Corollary 19.2 *Let f be a section of $\mathcal{M}'$. There exists a positive integer such that $f \cdot g^N$ naturally gives the section of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}'}$*

Proof It immediately follows from Lemma 19.21. ▮

Let us show the equality $\mathcal{M}' = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. To show it, we consider the inclusion $X \longrightarrow X \times \boldsymbol{C}$ for the graph of g. Let t denote the coordinate of $\boldsymbol{C}$. We have only to show $i_{g\,*}\mathcal{M}' = i_{g\,*}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$.

We denote the V-filtration along $t = 0$ of $i_{g\,*}\mathcal{M}'$ and $i_{g\,*}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ by $V^{(\lambda_0)}$.

Let f be a section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\bigl(i_{g\,*}\mathcal{M}'\bigr)$. We have the development:

$$f = \sum f_i \cdot \eth_t^i.$$

Due to Corollary 19.2, we have an integer N such that $f \cdot t^N \in V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\bigl(i_{g*}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'\bigr)$. Note $t = g$ on the graph of g.

The rests are completely same as the Step 1. Since $f \cdot t^N$ is contained in $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0} i_{g\,*}\mathcal{M}' \cap V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0} i_{g\,*}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$, we have $(f \cdot t^N) \cdot \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{M}' \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$. The V-filtrations $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\mathcal{M}')$ and $V^{(\lambda_0)}(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}')$ induce the same V-filtration on $(f \cdot t^N) \cdot \mathcal{R}$ (Lemma 19.12).

Since the multiplication of g on $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ are injective, it can be checked easily that the multiplication of t on $i_{g\,*}\mathcal{M}'$ and $i_{g\,*}\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ are injective. Then we obtain the implication $\mathcal{M}' \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ by the same argument as the proof of Lemma 19.13, and we obtain the equality $\mathcal{M}' = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}'$ by the same argument as the proof of Lemma 19.14. Thus we are done when Condition 19.2 is satisfied.

19.4.4 The end of the proof of Theorem 19.3

Let us consider the general case. Let U' be a Zariski open subset of U as in Lemma 19.15. We put $Y' := Z - U'$. Let us take a birational morphism $\varphi : \tilde{Z}' \longrightarrow Z$ such that $\tilde{Z}'$ is smooth and $\tilde{D}' := \varphi'^{-1}(Y')$ is a normal crossing divisor. We put $(\tilde{E}', \overline{\partial}_{\tilde{E}'}, \tilde{h}', \tilde{\theta}') := \varphi'^{-1}((E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h))$. Then we obtain the regular pure twistor D-module $\mathcal{M}(\tilde{E}') := (\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}', \tilde{\mathfrak{E}}', \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}')$. Taking the the push-forward via φ', and taking the component whose strict support is X, we obtain $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ as is explained in the subsubsection 19.4.1. Due to the result in the subsubsection 19.4.3, we have the naturally defined isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}' \simeq \mathcal{T}$. By applying the same consideration to $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, we have the isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}' \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Thus we obtain the isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \simeq \mathcal{T}$. ∎

19.5 The pure imaginary case

19.5.1 The correspondence in the pure imaginary case

Let X be a complex manifold, and Z be an irreducible closed subset of X. Let $\mathrm{VPT_{gen}}^{pi}(Z, w)$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of generically defined tame variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight w on Z. Let $\mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of polarized regular pure twistor module of weight w whose strict support is Z. (See the subsubsection 19.1.1 for the definitions.) Restricting the correspondence of Theorem 19.1 to the pure imaginary cases, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 19.4 *We have the bijective correspondence* $\mathrm{VPT_{gen}}^{pi}(Z, w) \simeq \mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$.

We have only to show the following:

- The image of $\mathrm{VPT_{gen}}^{pi}(Z, w)$ via the map $\mathrm{VPT_{gen}}(Z, w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{MPT}(Z, w)$ (the subsection 19.3) is contained in $\mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$. The sketch of the proof is given in the subsubsection 19.5.2.
- The image of $\mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$ via the map $\mathrm{MPT}(Z, w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{VPT_{gen}}(Z, w)$ (the subsection 19.2) is contained in $\mathrm{VPT_{gen}}^{pi}(Z, w)$.

Both of them are the minor modifications of the previous argument. Hence we give only a sketch of the proof.

19.5.2 The prolongation preserves the pure imaginary property

Let U be a smooth Zariski open subset of Z. Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame pure imaginary harmonic bundle on U. We have the prolongment $\mathcal{T} = \bigl(\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{C}\bigr)$ as pure twistor D-module on Z of $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$.

Proposition 19.2 *The pure twistor D-module $\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{O}(w)$ is pure imaginary.*

Proof We use an induction on the dimension of X. Since the property is local, we can assume that $X = \Delta^n = \big\{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \,\big|\, |z_i| < 1\big\}$, $D_i = \big\{z_i = 0\big\}$ and $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_i$.

Lemma 19.22 *In the case $g = \prod_{i=1}^{n} z_i^{m_i}$, we have the following:*

- $\tilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{T} = 0$ *unless* $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times (\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R})$.
- *The twistor D-module* $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{T}$ *is pure imaginary.*

Proof From (326), Lemma 16.10 and the strictness of Ψ_b (Proposition 16.3), we obtain $\psi_{t,u}\big(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{C}\big) = 0$ unless $u \in \boldsymbol{R}\times\big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$. Then the first claim immediately follows. From Lemma 16.26 and the strictness of $\psi_{t,u}\big(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{C}\big)$, we obtain the vanishing ${}^{i}\psi_v \psi_{t,u}\big(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{C}\big) = 0$ unless $v \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$. It follows that ${}^{i}\psi_v \operatorname{Gr}^{W(N)} \psi_{t,u}\big(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{C}\big) = 0$ unless $v \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$. Recall that we have the decomposition $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \psi_{t,u}\big(i_{g\,*}\mathfrak{C}\big) = \bigoplus_I \mathcal{M}_I$ as in Proposition 17.1. Then we obtain $\psi_{z_i,v}\mathcal{M} = 0$ unless $v \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$. It means that the tame harmonic bundle corresponding to the pure twistor D-modules $\big(\mathcal{M}_I, \mathcal{M}_I, \mathfrak{C}_I\big)$ given as in the subsubsection 18.5.2 are pure imaginary. Due to the hypothesis of our induction for the proof of Proposition 19.2, we obtain that the twistor D-modules $\big(\mathcal{M}_I, \mathcal{M}_I, \mathfrak{C}_I\big)$ are pure imaginary. Thus we can conclude that $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{T}$ are pure imaginary. ∎

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 19.2. Let g be a general holomorphic function on X. Let us take the birational map $\pi : \widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ such that $\big(g \circ \pi\big)^{-1}(0)$ is normal crossing and that $\widetilde{X}$ is smooth. Note that $\pi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is pure imaginary (Lemma 7.1 in [39]). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ be the pure twistor D-module corresponding to $\pi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$. We put $\tilde{g} := g \circ \pi$. From Lemma 19.22, we know that $\widetilde{\psi}_{\tilde{g},u}\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = 0$ unless $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$ and that $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \widetilde{\psi}_{\tilde{g},u}\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is pure imaginary. Note that $\mathcal{T}$ is the direct summand of $\pi_+\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ whose strict support is X. Then we obtain $\widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{T} = 0$ unless $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times \big(\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\big)$ from Theorem 3.3.15 in [43], and we obtain that $P_h \operatorname{Gr}_h^{W(N)} \widetilde{\psi}_{g,u}\mathcal{T}$ is pure imaginary from the argument in the section 6.2.b in [42]. Thus the proof of Proposition 19.2 is accomplished. ∎

We can show that the image of ${\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}}^{pi}(Z, w)$ via the map ${\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}}^{pi}(Z, w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{MPT}(Z, w)$ is contained in $\mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$, by using Proposition 19.2 and the argument in the subsubsection 19.3.2.

19.5.3 The generic part is also pure imaginary

Let $\mathcal{T} = \big(\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}\big)$ is a pure imaginary pure twistor D-module whose strict support is Z. We obtain the harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ on a Zariski dense subset U of Z, as in the subsubsection 19.2.1. Let us show that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is pure imaginary.

First we consider the case $\dim Z = 1$. Let Q be a point of $Z - U$. Since the property is local, we may assume the condition 19.1. Let $(E_1, \overline{\partial}_{E_1}, \theta_1, h_1)$ be as in the subsubsection 19.2.1. Due to the result of the section 5 in [43], $(E_1, \overline{\partial}_{E_1}, \theta_1, h_1)$ is pure imaginary. Or, we can directly check it by seeing the monodromy of $\big(\mathcal{E}_1^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}\big)$ for generic λ. Let $\pi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ be a resolution, and then $\pi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is a direct summand of $\big(q_1 \circ \pi\big)^{-1}\big(E_1, \overline{\partial}_{E_1}, \theta_1, h_1\big)$. Since $\big(q_1 \circ \pi\big)^{-1}\big(E_1, \overline{\partial}_{E_1}, \theta_1, h_1\big)$ is pure imaginary, we obtain that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is pure imaginary.

Let us consider the general case. Let $\pi : \tilde{Z} \longrightarrow Z$ be a resolution such that $\tilde{D} := \pi^{-1}\big(Z - U\big)$ is a normal crossing divisor of $\tilde{Z}$. Let C be a curve contained in $\tilde{Z}$, which intersects with the smooth part of $\tilde{D}$ transversally. Let us consider the specialization of $\mathcal{T}$ to $\pi(C)$, which is also pure imaginary. Then we obtain that $\pi^{-1}(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)_{|C \setminus \tilde{D}}$ is pure imaginary from the result in the one dimensional case, which is already discussed above. Therefore we obtain that $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ is pure imaginary.

Then it is easy to derive that the image of $\mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, w)$ via the map $\mathrm{MPT}(Z, w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}(Z, w)$ is contained in ${\mathrm{VPT}_{\mathrm{gen}}}^{pi}(Z, w)$. In all, the proof of Theorem 19.4 is accomplished. ∎

19.6 The conjectures of Kashiwara and Sabbah

Let X be a complex manifold, and Z be an irreducible closed subset of X. Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', \mathfrak{C})$ be a pure imaginary pure twistor D-module. $\Xi_{Dol}(\mathcal{T})$ is defined to be the D-module $\mathcal{M}'_{|\lambda=1}$. We refer the 4.1.i in [43] for the fundamental property of the functor Ξ_{Dol}. In particular, we recall the following:

Proposition 19.3 (Sabbah [43]) *$\Xi_{Dol}(\mathcal{T})$ is a semisimple regular holonomic D-module.* ∎

We have a Zariski open subset U of Z such that the restriction $\mathcal{T}_{|U}$ is a variation of polarized pure twistor structures. By considering the restriction to $\lambda = 1$, we obtain the flat bundle, or equivalently the local system L. We remark that it is semisimple. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the regular holonomic D-module on Z, which corresponds to the intermediate extension of L via the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence. Since $\Xi_{Dol}(\mathcal{T})$ is semisimple, we have the isomorphism $\mathcal{F} \simeq \Xi_{Dol}(\mathcal{T})$.

Let $\mathrm{RHD}^{ss}(Z)$ denote the set of the equivalence classes of the semisimple regular holonomic D-modules whose strict support is Z. As is explained above, we have the map $\Xi_{Dol} : \mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, 0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHD}^{ss}(Z)$.

Theorem 19.5 (The conjecture of Sabbah) *The map $\Xi_{Dol} : \mathrm{MPT}^{pi}(Z, 0) \longrightarrow \mathrm{RHD}^{ss}(Z)$ is surjective.*

Proof Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the element of $\mathrm{RHD}^{ss}(Z)$. We have a smooth Zariski open subset U of Z such that $\mathcal{F}_{|U}$ corresponds to a flat bundle. We can take a tame pure imaginary pluri-harmonic metric h of $\mathcal{F}_{|U}$ (Theorem 6.2 in [39]). Hence we obtain the tame pure imaginary harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ on U. Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C})$ denote the pure imaginary pure twistor D-module corresponding to $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ given in Theorem 19.4. Since the restrictions of the semisimple regular holonomic D-modules $\mathcal{F}$ and $\Xi_{Dol}(\mathcal{T})$ to U are isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{|U}$, they are isomorphic. Thus we obtain the surjectivity desired. ∎

Remark 19.1 *We formulate the theorem as the surjectivity between the sets of the equivalence classes, Ξ_{Dol} is given as the functor which is compatible with the vanishing cycle functors and the push-forward (see* [43]*). As a result, we obtain the regular holonomic version of Kashiwara's conjecture, combining the results of Sabbah and us.* ∎

Part V

Appendix

20 Pure twistor D-modules and polarization

20.1 Pure twistor D-modules and polarization

We recall the definitions of pure twistor D-modules and its polarization, due to Sabbah, given in Chapter 4 in his paper [42]. The definitions are based on the work of Saito on his celebrated pure Hodge modules, as Sabbah himself noted in [42]. We shall consider only the regular holonomic case.

20.1.1 Pure twistor D-modules

We only consider the regular case. Let X be an n-dimensional complex manifold. Let w be an integer. The definition of pure twistor D-modules of weight w is given as follows, inductively.

Definition 20.1 (Definition 4.1.2. [42]**)** *The category $MT^{(r)}_{\leq d}(X, w)$ is defined to be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{R} - \mathrm{Triples}(X)$, whose object $(\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'', C)$ satisfies the following:*

(HSD) *The $\mathcal{R}$-modules $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ are holonomic and strictly S-decomposable. The dimension of their strict support is less than d.*

(REG) *Let U be any open subset of X, and f be any holomorphic function on U. Then $\mathcal{M}'_{|U}$ and $\mathcal{M}''_{|U}$ are regular along $\{f = 0\}$.*

(MT_0) *Let us consider the case* $d=0$. *Let* $\{x_i\}$ *be the union of the strict supports of* $\mathcal{M}'$ *and* $\mathcal{M}''$. *Then we have* $\bigl(\mathcal{M}'_{|\{x_i\}}, \mathcal{M}''_{|\{x_i\}}, C\bigr) = i_{\{x_i\}\,+}\bigl(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{H}'', C_0\bigr)$, *where* $\bigl(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{H}'', C_0\bigr)$ *is a pure twistor structure of dimension* 0 *and weight* w.

$(MT_{>0})$ *Let us consider the case* $d>0$. *Let* U *be any open subset of* X, *and* f *be any holomorphic function on* U. *Let* u *be any element of* $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}-\bigl(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\times\{0\}\bigr)$, *and* l *be any integer. Then the induced* $\mathcal{R}$*-triple* $\mathrm{Gr}^W_l\,\tilde{\psi}_{f,u}(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C) := \bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W_{-l}\,\tilde{\psi}_{f,u}(\mathcal{M}'), \mathrm{Gr}^W_l\,\tilde{\psi}_{f,u}(\mathcal{M}''), \mathrm{Gr}^W_l\,\tilde{\psi}_{f,u}C\bigr)$ *is the object of* $MU^{(r)}_{\leq d-1}(U, w+l)$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 20.1 Since our index set of the KMS-structure is not $\boldsymbol{R}\times\{0\}$ but $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$, our pure twistor D-module is wider than those given by Sabbah's definition. However it is just a minor modification, and the results and the proofs in the section 4.1. in [42] are valid, when we change as follows:

- "$\alpha\in[-1,0[$" $\Longrightarrow$ "$u\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}-\bigl(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\times\{0\}\bigr)$".
- "$\alpha\in[-1,0]$" $\Longrightarrow$ "$u\in\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$".
- "$\psi_{t,\alpha}$" $\Longrightarrow$ "$\tilde{\psi}_{t,u}$".
- "$z_o\in\boldsymbol{C}^*$" $\Longrightarrow$ "any generic λ_0". This case appears only in Proposition 4.1.21 (1) in [42]. $\blacksquare$

For example, Proposition 4.1.3 is changed as follows:

Lemma 20.1 *Let* $(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C)$ *is an object of* $MT^{(r)}_{\leq d}(X,w)$. *Then* $\mathcal{M}'$ *and* $\mathcal{M}''$ *are strict.*

Let U *be any open subset of* X, *and* f *be any holomorphic function on* U. *Let* u *be any element of* $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}$. *Then* $\tilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}')$ *and* $\tilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}'')$ *are strict.* $\blacksquare$

Since the paper [42] is very well written, and since the modification is quite minor, we do not reproduce the propositions and the proof, here. We recommend the reader to see [42].

20.1.2 Polarization

We recall only the definition of polarization of pure twistor D-modules, which is given in the subsection 4.2 in [42]

Definition 20.2 (Definition 4.2.2 **in** [42]**)** *Let* $\mathcal{T}$ *be an object of* $MT^{(r)}_{\leq d}(X,w)$. *A polarization of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is a sesqui-linear Hermitian duality* $\mathcal{S}:\mathcal{T}\longrightarrow\mathcal{T}^*(-w)$ *of weight* w *satisfying the following:*

(MTP_0) *Let us consider the case* $d=0$. *Let* $\{x_i\}$ *be the strict support of* $\mathcal{T}$. *We may assume that* $\mathcal{T} = i_{\{x_i\}\,+}\bigl(\mathcal{H}',\mathcal{H}'',C_0\bigr)$. *Then we have* $\mathcal{S} = i_{\{x_i\}\,+}\mathcal{S}_0$ *for some polarization* $\mathcal{S}_0$ *of* $\bigl(\mathcal{H}',\mathcal{H}'',C_0\bigr)$.

$(MTP_{>0})$ *Let us consider the case* $d>0$. *Let* U *be any open subset of* X, *and* f *be any holomorphic function on* U. *Let* u *be an element of* $\boldsymbol{R}\times\boldsymbol{C}-\{\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\times\{0\}\}$, *and* l *be any non-negative integer. Then* $P\,\mathrm{Gr}^W_l\,\tilde{\psi}_{t,u}S$ *gives a polarization of* $P_l\,\mathrm{Gr}^W_l\,\tilde{\psi}_{t,u}\mathcal{T}$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 20.2 Again the propositions and the proofs in the subsection 4.2 in [42] are valid, when we change them as in Remark 20.1.

20.2 Pure imaginary pure twistor D-modules

20.2.1 The definition

We have the inclusion of the set of the pure imaginary numbers $\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R}\subset\boldsymbol{C}$.

Definition 20.3 (Pure imaginary pure twistor D-module) *The category* $MT^{sabbah}_{\leq d}(X,w)$ *is defined to be the full subcategory of* $\mathcal{R}$*-Triples(X), whose objects* $(\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{M}'',C)$ *satisfy the following conditions, in addition to the conditions in Definition* 20.1*:*

(PI) *We have* $\widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}') = \widetilde{\psi}_{t,u}(\mathcal{M}'') = 0$ *unless* $u \in \boldsymbol{R} \times (\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{R})$.

Such objects are called pure imagianry pure twistor D*-module.*

A polarization of a pure imaginary pure twistor D*-module is defined by Definition* 20.2. ▮

Remark 20.3 Sabbah give the definition of pure twistor D-modules in [43], which is our pure imaginary pure twistor D-module. Since his purpose is to attack Kashiwara's conjecture, it is natural to restrict the attention to pure imaginary case. On the other hand, our definition may be natural from the view point of Simpson's Meta Theorem. ▮

20.3 The pure twistor D-modules on a smooth curve (correspondence)

Let C be a holomorphic curve.

Generalizing the result in Chapter 5 of [42], we can show the following:

Theorem 20.1 *Let* w *be any integer. The variation of polarized pure twistor structures of weight* w *which are generically defined over* C*, are bijectively corresponds to the regular pure twistor* D*-modules of weight* w *whose strict support is* C*.*

Remark 20.4 Theorem 20.1 is a special case of Theorem 19.2 and Theorem 19.3. Although we use the decomposition theorem in the proof Theorem 19.3, we do not need the decomposition theorem in the proof, if the dimension of the base manifold is 1, for we do not have to consider the blow up in that case. However, we give an explanation of the correspondence and an outline of the proof. ▮

Outline of the proof of Theorem 20.1 We only consider the case $w = 0$, for we have only to consider the tensor product with $\mathcal{O}(w)$ to obtain the other cases.

Let $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle defined over a Zariski open subset $C' \subset C$. Then we obtain the pure twistor D-module $\mathcal{T}(E) := (\mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{C})$, as proved in Theorem 19.2. It is easy to see that the restriction $\mathcal{T}(E)_{|C'}$ gives the harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$.

On the other hand, Let $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}, C, Id)$ be a regular pure twistor D-module on C. Then we have a Zariski open subset C', such that $\mathcal{T}_{|C'}$ gives a harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$. Due to the regularity, it is tame. Then we obtain the pure twistor D-modules $\mathcal{T}(E)$.

Lemma 20.2 *We have the naturally defined isomorphism* $\mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}(E)$*.*

Proof On the Zariski open subset C', we have the isomorphism $\mathcal{T}_{|C'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}(E)_{|C'}$, due to our construction of $\mathcal{T}(E)_{|C'}$. We shall prolong the morphism defined on C' to the morphism defined on C. For that purpose, we have only to discuss on a neighbourhood of a point $P \in C - C'$. So we can assume that $C = \Delta$ and $C' = \Delta^*$. Let z be the coordinate of Δ.

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$ which is generic with respect to the sets $KMS(\mathcal{M}, z)$ and $KMS(\mathfrak{E}, z)$. Then the restrictions $\mathcal{M}_{|\{\lambda_0\}\times C}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{|\{\lambda_0\}\times C}$ can be regarded as regular holonomic D-modules, which are strictly S-decomposable. Let L be a local system corresponds to the flat connection $V = \mathcal{M}_{|\{\lambda_0\}\times\Delta^*} = \mathfrak{E}_{|\{\lambda_0\}\times\Delta^*}$. By Riemann-Hilbert correspondence, both of regular holonomic D-modules $\mathcal{M}_{|\lambda_0}$ and $\mathfrak{E}_{|\lambda_0}$ correspond to the perverse sheaf which is the intermediate extension of L. Thus we have the isomorphism $\mathcal{M}_{|\lambda_0} \simeq \mathfrak{E}_{|\lambda_0}$. If we regard them as the submodules of $\iota_* V$, then we have $\mathcal{M}_{|\lambda_0} = \mathfrak{E}_{|\lambda_0}$. The V-filtrations are also same. (See the proof of Lemma 15.58 and Lemma 15.59.)

Let us pick a point $\lambda_0 \in \boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, which is not necessarily generic. Let f be a section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$. Let us pick any point $\lambda \in \Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0)$, which is generic. Then the restriction $f_{|\lambda}$ gives a section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}_{|\lambda}$.

The section f also gives the holomorphic section of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta^*$, which we denote by f. Since $f_{|\lambda}$ gives a section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}_{|\lambda}$, we have $-\mathrm{ord}(f_{|\lambda}) < 1$. Due to Corollary 2.6, we can conclude that f gives the section of $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}$. Thus we obtain the morphism $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathfrak{E}$ on $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is generated by $V^{(\lambda_0)}_{<0}\mathcal{M}$, we obtain the morphism $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ defined over $\Delta(\lambda_0, \epsilon_0) \times \Delta$, and thus the morphism defined over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda \times \Delta$.

Once we obtain the morphism $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ whose restriction to C' is isomorphic, the morphism is isomorphic on C, due to the strictly S-decomposability of the both sides. It is easy to see that the sesqui-linear pairings also coincide (Corollary 18.1).

▮

21 The decomposition theorem for pure twistor D-modules

Let X and Y be complex manifolds, and f be a projective morphism from X to Y. Let c be the first Chern class of a relatively ample line bundle on X with respect to f. The decomposition theorem and the hard Lefschetz theorem for pure twistor D-modules is as follows.

Theorem 21.1 (Theorem 6.1.1 in [42]) *Let $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{S})$ be a polarized pure twistor D-module of weight w on X. Then $\bigl(\bigoplus_i f_+^i\mathcal{T},\mathcal{L}_c,\bigoplus_i f_+^i\bigr)$ is a polarized graded Lefschetz twistor D-modules.*

The decomposition theorem for polarized pure twistor D-module was shown by Sabbah in [42] (based on Saito's argument in [44]). Although our pure twistor D-modules (Definition 20.1 and Definition 20.2) are wider than those given in [42], the argument of Sabbah-Saito essentially works. Roughly speaking, their argument is divided into the following two steps.

Step 1 By using the induction on the dimensions of $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{T})$ and $f\bigl(\mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{T})\bigr)$, the problem is reduced to the decomposition theorem for a pure twistor D-modules on a smooth projective curve. (See the sections 6.2.b and 6.2.c in [42]. See also the section 5.3 in [44].)

Step 2 We prove the decomposition theorem for the pure twistor D-module on a smooth projective curve. (See the sections 6.2.a in [42]. See also the sections 6, 7 and 11 in [57].)

Since we do not have to change the argument for the step 1, we only give an argument for the step 2. Although it is just a minor modification of the argument given in [57] and [42], we give some detail.

21.1 Preliminary

21.1.1 Preliminary calculation of cohomology

Following Zucker, we put $\mathfrak{M}_1 := \mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{B}$, where $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are given as follows:

$$\mathfrak{A} := \Bigl\{\text{measurable function } f \Bigm| \int_0^A |f(r)|^2\cdot|\log r|\cdot r\cdot dr<\infty \text{ for some } 0<A<1\Bigr\},$$

$$\mathfrak{B} := \Bigl\{f\in\mathfrak{A} \Bigm| f=u' \text{ weakly } \int_0^A |u|^2\cdot|\log r|^{-1}r^{-1}dr \text{ for some } 0<A<1\Bigr\}.$$

In the following, we use the Poincarè metric and the induced volume form on Δ^*.

Let V be a C^∞-vector bundle of rank 1 on Δ^* with a trivialization e. Let ∇ be the flat connection of V such that $\nabla(e)=\alpha\cdot e\cdot dz/z$ for some complex number α. Let h be a metric of V such that $h(e,e)=r^{-2a}\cdot|\log r|^k$ for some real number a and an integer k.

Let $\mathcal{L}^p(V)_{(2)}$ be the sheaf of germs of locally L^2-section of $V\otimes\Omega^p$ for which $\nabla(\phi)$ is L^2-section of $V\otimes\Omega^{p+1}$. Then we obtain the complex of sheaves $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)}$:

$$\mathcal{L}^0(V)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^1(V)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^2(V)_{(2)}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)})$ denote the stalk of the i-th cohomology sheaves of $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)}$ at O.

Lemma 21.1 *In the case $\alpha\in\boldsymbol{C}-\mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)})=0$ for $i=0,1,2$.*

Proof The claim $i=0$ can be shown by a direct calculation. The claims for $i=1,2$ are shown by Zucker in Prop (11.3) in his paper. Note that the condition $-1<\alpha=-a<0$ is imposed in the section 11 in his paper. However the only assumption $\alpha\notin\mathbb{Z}$ is used in the proof of of Proposition (11.2). ▮

Let $H(V)$ denote the space of the flat sections of V.

Lemma 21.2 *In the case $\alpha = 0$, we have the following:*

$$\mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases} H(V) & (a<0,\ \text{or}\ \ a=0,k\le 0)\\ & \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases} \tag{406}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases} \dfrac{dt}{t}\otimes H(V), & (a<0,\ \text{or}\ a=0,k\le -2)\\ & \\ \mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\otimes H(V), & (a=0,k=1)\\ & \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise})\end{cases} \tag{407}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^2\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V)_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases} \mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\wedge\dfrac{dt}{t}\otimes H(V), & (a=0,k=-1)\\ & \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases} \tag{408}$$

The proof of Lemma 21.2, due to Zucker, will be given in the subsubsections 21.1.2–21.1.4. Before entering the proof, we give the formulas of the norms of the sections of $V\otimes\Omega^i$.

$$\int|f\cdot e|^2\,\mathrm{dvol}=\int|f|^2\cdot r^{-2a}\cdot|\log r|^k\cdot\frac{dr\cdot d\theta}{r\cdot|\log r|^2}=\int|f|^2\cdot r^{-2a-1}\cdot|\log r|^{k-2}\cdot dr\cdot d\theta. \tag{409}$$

$$\int|f\cdot dr\cdot e|^2\,\mathrm{dvol}=\int|f|^2\cdot r^2\cdot|\log r|^2\cdot r^{-2a}|\log r|^k\cdot\frac{dr\cdot d\theta}{r\cdot|\log r|^2}=\int|f|^2\cdot r^{-2a+1}\cdot|\log r|^k\cdot dr\cdot d\theta. \tag{410}$$

$$\int|f\cdot d\theta\cdot e|^2\cdot\mathrm{dvol}=\int|f|^2\cdot|\log r|^2\cdot r^{-2a}\cdot|\log r|^k\cdot\frac{dr\cdot d\theta}{r|\log r|^2}=\int|f|^2\cdot r^{-2a-1}|\log r|^k\cdot dr\cdot d\theta. \tag{411}$$

$$\int|f\cdot dr\cdot d\theta\cdot e|^2\,\mathrm{dvol}=\int|f|^2r^{-2a-1}\cdot|\log r|^{k+2}\cdot dr\cdot d\theta. \tag{412}$$

Here f denotes C^{∞}-functions, and the metrics of $V\otimes\Omega^i$ are induced by the metric h of V and the Poincarè metric.

We denote the L^2-norm by $||\cdot||_{(2)}$.

21.1.2 The calculation of $\mathcal{H}^0$

From (409), we have $\int|e|^2\,\mathrm{dvol}<\infty$ if and only if we have $a<0$ or $a=0,k\le 0$. Thus (406) immediately follows.

21.1.3 The calculation of $\mathcal{H}^1$

We need a preparation. Let $\omega=f\cdot dr+g\cdot d\theta$ be a C^{∞}-section of $E\otimes\Omega^1$, whose support is compact. We have the Fourier developments:

$$f=\sum f_n\cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta},\quad g=\sum g_n\cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}.$$

We take ϵ_n as follows:

$$d\omega=\sum(g_n'-\sqrt{-1}n\cdot f_n)\cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}dr\wedge d\theta=\sum\epsilon_n\cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}dr\wedge d\theta.$$

We put $u_n:=(n\sqrt{-1})^{-1}g_n$ for $n\neq 0$, and we put $u:=\sum_{n\neq 0}u_n\cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}$. Then the n-th Fourier coefficient $(du)_n$ of du is as follows:

$$(du)_n:=u_n'+\sqrt{-1}n\cdot u_n\cdot d\theta=(n\sqrt{-1})^{-1}g_n'\cdot dr+g_n\cdot d\theta=f_n\cdot dr+g_n\cdot d\theta-\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{n}\epsilon_n\cdot dr.$$

Thus we obtain the following:

$$U := du - \omega - (f_0 \cdot dr + g_0 \cdot d\theta) = -\sqrt{-1} \sum_{n \neq 0} n^{-1} \cdot \epsilon_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1} n\theta} \cdot dr.$$

Lemma 21.3 *We have* $||U \cdot e||_{(2)} \leq ||d\omega \cdot e||_{(2)}$.

Proof From (410) and (412), we obtain the following:

$$||U \cdot e||_{(2)}^2 = \int |U \cdot e|^2 \,\mathrm{dvol} = \sum_{n \neq 0} n^{-2} \int |\epsilon_n|^2 \cdot r^{-2a+1} |\log r|^k \cdot dr.$$

$$||d\omega \cdot e||_{(2)}^2 = \int |d\omega \cdot e|^2 \cdot \mathrm{dvol} = \sum_{n \neq 0} \int |\epsilon_n|^2 \cdot r^{-2a+1} \cdot |\log r|^k \cdot dr.$$

Thus we are done. ∎

Let $\omega = f \cdot dr + g \cdot d\theta$ be a section of $\mathcal{L}^1$ such that $d\omega = 0$. We have the Fourier development $f = \sum f_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}$ and $g = \sum g_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}$. We can take a sequence $\{\omega^{(k)} \,|\, k = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ satisfying the following:

- $\omega^{(k)}$ is C^∞-section of $V \otimes \Omega^1$, whose support is compact.
- $\{\omega^{(k)}\}$ converges to ω in L^2.
- $\{d\omega^{(k)}\}$ converges to 0 in L^2.

For each $\omega^{(k)}$, we take $u^{(k)} \in \mathcal{L}^0(V)_{(2)}$ as above. Then $\{u^{(k)}\}$ converges to $\sum_{n \neq 0} n^{-1} \cdot g_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1}n\theta}$, and we have the following:

$$||du^{(k)} - \omega^{(k)} - (f_0^{(k)} dr + g_0^{(k)} d\theta)||_{(2)} \leq ||d\omega^{(k)}||_{(2)} \to 0, \quad (k \to \infty).$$

Hence $\omega - (f_0 \cdot dr + g_0 \cdot d\theta)$ is coboundary.

We also have $(d\omega^{(k)})_0 = g_0^{(k)} \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$. Thus we have $\lim_{k \to \infty} g_0^{(k)} = g_0$ and $\lim_{k \to \infty} g_0^{(k)\prime} = 0$. Thus g_0 is constant. Moreover we have $\int |g_0 \cdot d\theta \cdot e|^2 \,\mathrm{dvol} < \infty$ if and only if we have $a < 0$ or $a = 0, k < -1$. In the case $a < 0$ or $a = 0, k < -1$, we have $(\log r) \cdot e \in L^2$ and $d \log r \cdot e \in L^2$. Thus $g_0 \frac{dt}{t} \cdot e$ and $\sqrt{-1} g_0 \cdot d\theta \cdot e$ are same modulo $d \cdot \mathcal{L}^0$.

Let us consider the equation $u_0' = f_0$. From (410), we have $\int |f_0| \cdot r^{-2a+1} \cdot |\log r|^k dr < \infty$.

Lemma 21.4 *If* $a < 0$ *or* $a = 0, k < 1$, *then* $f_0 \cdot dr$ *is a coboundary.*

Proof We put $\int_A^r f_0 \cdot d\rho$. We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |u_0|^2 \leq \int_r^A |f_0|^2 \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1-\epsilon} \cdot \int_r^A \rho^{-1} |\log \rho|^{-1+\epsilon} d\rho &= \epsilon^{-1} \int_r^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1-\epsilon} d\rho \cdot (\log A^\epsilon - \log r) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon^{-1} \cdot \int_r^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1-\epsilon} d\rho \cdot |\log r|. \end{aligned} \tag{413}$$

Here ϵ is a positive number. In the case $a = 0$, we impose the condition $0 < \epsilon < 1 - k$. Then we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_0 \cdot e||_{(2)}^2 &= \int_0^A |u_0|^2 r^{-2a-1} |\log r|^{k-2} dr \leq 2\epsilon^{-1} \cdot \int_0^A \int_r^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho |\log \rho|^{1-\epsilon} d\rho \cdot |\log r|^\epsilon r^{-2a-1} |\log r|^{k-2} dr \\ &= 2\epsilon^{-1} \cdot \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho |\log \rho|^{1-\epsilon} d\rho \cdot \int_0^\rho r^{-2a-1} |\log r|^{k-2+\epsilon} dr \leq C \cdot \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \rho^{-2a+1} |\log \rho|^{k-1} \cdot d\rho \\ &\leq C \cdot \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \rho^{-2a+1} |\log \rho|^k \cdot d\rho = C \cdot ||f_0 \cdot dr \cdot e||_{(2)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{414}$$

Here C is positive constant depending only on ϵ, a and k. Thus Lemma 21.4 follows. ∎

Lemma 21.5 *If $a > 0$ or $a = 0, k > 1$, then $f_0 \cdot dr$ is a coboundary.*

Proof We put $u_0 := \int_0^r f_0 \cdot d\rho$. Then we have the following:

$$|u_0|^2 \leq \int_0^r |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1+\epsilon} \cdot d\rho \cdot \int_0^r \rho^{-1} \cdot |\log \rho|^{-1-\epsilon} d\rho = \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^r |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1+\epsilon} d\rho \cdot |\log r|^{-\epsilon}.$$

Here ϵ denotes a positive number. In the case $a = 0$, we impose the condition $0 < \epsilon < k - 1$. We obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_0 \cdot e||^2_{(2)} &= \int_0^A |u_0|^2 \cdot r^{-2a-1} \cdot |\log r|^{k-2} dr \leq \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \int_0^A \int_0^r |f_0|^2 \cdot |\log \rho|^{1+\epsilon} \cdot d\rho \cdot |\log r|^{k-2-\epsilon} \cdot r^{-2a-1} dr \\ &= \epsilon^{-1} \cdot \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho \cdot |\log \rho|^{1+\epsilon} d\rho \cdot \int_\rho^A r^{-2a-1} |\log r|^{k-2-\epsilon} dr \leq C \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho^{-2a+1} |\log \rho|^{k-1} d\rho \\ &\leq C \cdot \int_0^A |f_0|^2 \cdot \rho^{-2a+1} |\log \rho|^k d\rho = ||f_0 \cdot dr \cdot e||^2_{(2)}. \qquad (415) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we are done. ∎

In the case $a = 0, k = 1$, the group $\mathfrak{M}_1 \otimes dr \otimes H(V)$ remains.

21.1.4 The calculation of $\mathcal{H}^2$

We put $\omega = f \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$. We have the Fourier development $f = \sum_n f_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1} n\theta}$. For $n \neq 0$, we put $g_n := (n\sqrt{-1})^{-1} f_n$ and $g = \sum_{n \neq 0} g_n \cdot e^{\sqrt{-1} n\theta}$. Then we have $d(g \cdot dr) = \omega - f_0 \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$. We also have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} ||g \cdot dr||^2_{(2)} &= 2\pi \sum_{n \neq 0} \int |g_n|^2 \cdot r^{-2a} \cdot |\log r|^k \cdot r \cdot dr = 2\pi \sum_{n \neq 0} n^{-2} \int |f_n|^2 \cdot r^{-2a+1} \cdot |\log r|^k dr \\ &\leq C \sum_{n \neq 0} n^{-2} \int |f_n|^2 \cdot r^{-2a+1} |\log r|^{k+2} dr \leq C \cdot ||\omega||^2_{(2)}. \qquad (416) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\omega - f_0 \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$ is a coboundary.

Let us consider the equation $d(\eta_0) = f_0 \cdot dr \wedge d\theta \cdot e$ for $\eta_0 = h_0 \cdot d\theta \cdot e$. In the case $a < 0$ or $a = 0, k < -1$, we put $h_0 = \int_A^r f_0 \cdot d\rho$. In the case $a > 0$ or $a_0, k > -1$, we put $h_0 = \int_0^r f_0 \cdot d\rho$. Then, as before h_0 is the L^2-section. Thus $f_0 \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$ is a coboundary.

In the case $a = 0, k = -1$, the group $\mathfrak{M}_1 \cdot dr \wedge d\theta$ remains. Note we have $\sqrt{-1} dr \wedge d\theta = dr \wedge dt/t$.

Thus the proof of Lemma 21.2 is finished. ∎

21.2 Quasi isomorphisms of complexes of sheaves

21.2.1 The complexes $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E)$ and $\left(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \otimes \Omega^{\cdot,0}\right)_{(2)}$

Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle over Δ^*. Let $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ be the λ-connection on E, and h be a hermitian metric of E. Let $\mathcal{L}^p(E)$ denote the sheaf on Δ of germs of locally L^2-sections ϕ of $E \otimes \Omega^p$ for which $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\phi$ are L^2-sections of $E \otimes \Omega^{p+1}$. Then we obtain the complex of sheaves $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E)$ induced by $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$.

Let us consider a tame harmonic bundle $(E, \overline{\partial}_E, \theta, h)$ over Δ^*. We obtain $(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}, \mathbb{D}^{\lambda}, h)$ over Δ^*. We have the projection:

$${}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}{}_{|O} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathrm{Gr}^F_0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}) = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \boldsymbol{C}} \mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^F_0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}), \beta\big).$$

We have the weight filtration W on $\mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^F_0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}), \beta\big)$, induced by the nilpotent part of the residue. We put as follows:

$$I := W_1 \mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^F_0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}), 0\big) \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \neq 0} W_{-1} \mathbb{E}\big(\mathrm{Gr}^F_0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}), \beta\big).$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{(2)} := \bigl\{ f \in {}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \,\big|\, \pi(f_{|O}) \in I \bigr\}.$$

We also put as follows:

$$\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}\bigr)_{(2)} := \bigl\{ f \in \bigl({}^{\diamond}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}\bigr)_{(2)} \,\big|\, \pi(f) \in W_{-1}\,\mathrm{Gr}^F_0\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{|O}\bigr) \bigr\}.$$

The λ-connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$ induces the morphism $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{(2)} \longrightarrow \bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}\bigr)_{(2)}$. We denote the complex by $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}$.

Lemma 21.6 *We have the following:*

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{(2)} = \bigl\{ f \in \mathcal{E}^{\lambda} \,\big|\, ||f||_{(2)} < \infty,\ ||\mathbb{D}^{\lambda} f||_{(2)} < \infty \bigr\},$$
$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_{(2)} = \bigl\{ f \in \mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{1,0} \,\big|\, ||f||_{(2)} < \infty \bigr\}.$$

Proof It is clear from our construction and the norm estimate. ▮

We have the naturally defined morphism $\Psi : \bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})$.

Proposition 21.1 *The morphism Ψ is quasi isomorphic.*

The proposition 21.1 is also essentially due to Zucker [57]. We divide the proof into the two cases. The case $\lambda = 0$ is discussed in the subsubsections 21.2.2–21.2.4. The case $\lambda \neq 0$ is discussed in the subsubsections 21.2.5–21.2.7.

21.2.2 The case $\lambda = 0$, Preliminary

Let us consider the case $\lambda = 0$. We have ${}^{\diamond}E$ over Δ, the Higgs field $\theta = f \cdot dz/z$ and the metric h. We have the decomposition (the subsubsection 8.2.1):

$$E = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(f_{|O})} E_{\alpha}, \quad f = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\mathcal{S}p(f_{|O})} f_{\alpha}, \quad f_{\alpha} \in \mathrm{End}(E_{\alpha}).$$

We may assume that there exists a sufficiently small positive number ϵ such that $|\alpha-\beta| < \epsilon$ for any eigenvalue of $f_{\alpha\,|\,P}$ $(P \in \Delta^*)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$ be a frame of ${}^{\diamond}E$ compatible with the following:

- The decomposition $E = \bigoplus E_{\alpha}$.
- The parabolic filtration F of $E_{|O}$.
- The weight filtration on $\mathrm{Gr}^F(E_{|O})$.

For each v_i, we put as follows:

$$b(v_i) := \deg^F(v_i), \quad \alpha(v_i) := \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_i), \quad h(v_i) := \frac{\deg^W(v_i)}{2}.$$

If we put $v'_i := v_i \cdot (-\log|z_i|)^{-h(v_i)} \cdot |z|^{b(v_i)}$ and $\boldsymbol{v'} := (v'_i)$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{v'}$ is adapted over Δ^* due to Simpson (see the subsubsection 4.3.3 in [38]). Let us consider the metric $\tilde{h}$ determined as follows:

$$\tilde{h}(v_i, v_j) := \delta_{i\,j} \cdot |z|^{-2b(v_i)} \cdot \bigl(-\log|z|^2\bigr)^{-2h(v_i)}.$$

Then the metrics $\tilde{h}$ and h are mutually bounded. Since the complexes $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E,h)$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E,\tilde{h})$ coincide, we may use the metric $\tilde{h}$ in the following argument.

We have the decompositions:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E)_{(2)} = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\boldsymbol{C}} \mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_{\alpha})_{(2)}, \quad \bigl(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)} = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\boldsymbol{C}} \bigl(E_{\alpha}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}.$$

The decompositions are compatible with the morphism Ψ. The claim of Proposition 21.1 for $\lambda = 0$ immediately follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 21.7 *The morphism $\Psi_{\alpha} : \bigl(E_{\alpha}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_{\alpha})_{(2)}$ is quasi isomorphic.*

Lemma 21.7 is proved in the subsubsections 21.2.3–21.2.4.

21.2.3 The proof of Lemma 21.7 ($\alpha = 0$)

In the case $\alpha = 0$, the morphism $\theta_0 : E_0 \longrightarrow E_0 \otimes \Omega^{1,0}$ is bounded. Let us consider the sheaf $\mathcal{L}^{p,q}(E_0)_{(2)}$ on Δ of germs of locally L^2-section of $E_0 \otimes \Omega^{p,q}$, for which $\overline{\partial}\phi$ is L^2. Then we obtain the complex of sheaves $\mathcal{L}^{p,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}$:

$$\mathcal{L}^{p,0}(E_0)_{(2)} \xrightarrow{\overline{\partial}} \mathcal{L}^{(p,1)}(E_0)_{(2)}.$$

We denote the cohomology sheaves of $\mathcal{L}^{p,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}$ by $\mathcal{H}^{p,\cdot}$.

Lemma 21.8 *We have the following isomorphisms:*

$$\mathcal{H}^{0,0} \simeq E_{0\,(2)}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{1,0} \simeq \big(E_0 \otimes \Omega^{1,0}\big)_{(2)},$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{0,1} \simeq \mathfrak{M}_1 \otimes d\bar{t} \otimes \operatorname{Gr}^W_1 \operatorname{Gr}^F_0 \big(E_{0\,|\,O}\big),$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{1,1} \simeq \mathfrak{M}_1 \otimes d\bar{t} \otimes \frac{dt}{t} \otimes \operatorname{Gr}^W_{-1} \operatorname{Gr}^F_0 (E_{0\,|\,O}).$$

Proof To show Lemma 21.8, we need some preparation. We consider the lexicographic order on $\boldsymbol{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Let us consider the filtration $\tilde{F}$ of E_0 in the category of vector bundles indexed by $\boldsymbol{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$, given as follows:

$$\tilde{F}_{(b,k)}(E_0) := \big\langle v_i \,\big|\, \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(v_i) = 0,\ \big(\deg^F(v_i), \deg^W(v_i)\big) \leq (b,k)\big\rangle.$$

Then we obtain the vector bundle $V_{b,k} = \operatorname{Gr}^{\tilde{F}}_{(b,k)}(E_0)$ on Δ^*. The tuple $\boldsymbol{v}_{0\,b,k} = \{v_i \,|\, \alpha(v_i) = 0, b(v_i) = b, 2h(v_i) = k\}$ naturally induces the frame of $V_{b,k}$. We denote it by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0\,b,k} = \big(\tilde{v}_i \,|\, \alpha(v_i) = 0, b(v_i) = b, 2h(v_i) = k\big)$.

We have the naturally induced metric $\tilde{h}_{b,k}$ on $V_{b,k}$, for which we have $\tilde{h}_{b,k}\big(\bar{v}_i, \bar{v}_j\big) = \delta_{i\,j} \cdot |z|^{-2b} \cdot \big|\log|z|\big|^k$. For the complex $\big(\mathcal{L}^{p,\cdot}(V_{b,h}), \overline{\partial}\big)$, we recall Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 11.5 in [57].

Lemma 21.9 *We have the following isomorphisms:*

$$\mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{p,\cdot}(V_{b,k})\big) \simeq \big(V_{b,k} \otimes \Omega^{p,0}\big)_{(2)},$$

$$\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{0,\cdot}(V_{b,k})\big) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{M}_1 \otimes V_{b,k\,|\,O} \cdot d\bar{t} & (b_0, k = 1), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^2\big(\mathcal{L}^{1,\cdot}(V_{b,k})\big) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{M}_1 \otimes V_{b,k\,|\,O} \cdot d\bar{t}\frac{dt}{t} & (b = 0, k = -1), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Proof The case $b = 0$ is shown in Proposition 6.4 in [57]. and the case $-1 < b < 0$ is shown in Proposition 11.5 in [57]. The general case can be reduced to the two cases above. ■

We have the naturally defined inclusion $\big(\operatorname{Gr}^{\tilde{F}}_{(b,k)}(E_0) \otimes \Omega^{i,0}\big)_{(2)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{i,\cdot}\big(\operatorname{Gr}^{\tilde{F}}_{(b,k)}(E_0)\big)$, and we have the isomorphism:

$$\big(\operatorname{Gr}^{\tilde{F}}_{(b,k)}(E_0) \otimes \Omega^{i,0}\big)_{(2)} \simeq \mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{i,\cdot}\big(\operatorname{Gr}^{\tilde{F}}_{(b,k)}(E_0)\big)\big).$$

We also have the isomorphism $(E_0 \otimes \Omega^{i,0})_{(2)} \simeq \mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{i,\cdot}(E_0)\big)_{(2)}$. Then Lemma 21.8 is obtained by an easy spectral sequence argument. ■

We have the morphism of the complexes: $\theta_0 : \mathcal{L}^{0,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{1,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}$. It is easy to see that it induces the isomorphism $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{0,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}\big) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{1,\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}\big)$. Then it follows from an easy spectral sequence argument, that the inclusion $\big(E_0 \otimes \Omega^{\cdot\,0}\big)_{(2)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_0)_{(2)}$ is quasi isomorphic.

21.2.4 The proof of Lemma 21.7 ($\alpha \neq 0$)

This is the easier part in the proof of Lemma 21.7. In the case $\alpha \neq 0$, the morphism $\theta_\alpha : E_\alpha \longrightarrow E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{1,0}$ is invertible. Let $F : E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{1,0} \longrightarrow E_\alpha$ denote the inverse. Then there exists a positive constant C such that $|F|_h \leq C \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-1}$.

The morphism F induces the morphism $E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{1,1} \longrightarrow E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{0,1}$, which we denote also by F.

Lemma 21.10 *We have* $\mathcal{H}^2\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)\big) = 0$.

Proof Let g be an L^2-section of $E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{1,1}$. Then $F(g)$ is the L^2-section of $E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{0,1}$ such that $\theta_\alpha(F(g)) = g$. It implies $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)) = 0$. ■

Lemma 21.11 *We have* $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)_{(2)}\big) = 0$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\big(E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\big) = 0$.

Proof The vanishing $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\big(E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\big) = 0$ can be checked directly. Let us show the vanishing $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)_{(2)}\big) = 0$. Let $g_1 \cdot d\bar{z} + g_2 \cdot dz$ be an L^2-section of $E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^1$ such that the following holds:

$$(\overline{\partial} + \theta)(g_1 \cdot d\bar{z} + g_2 \cdot dz) = \theta(g_1) \cdot d\bar{z} + \overline{\partial} g_2 \cdot dz = 0.$$

We put $g_3 := F(g_2 \cdot dz)$, which is a L^2-section of E_α. Then we have $\theta(g_3) = g_2 \cdot dz$ by our construction. We also have the following:

$$\theta_\alpha(\overline{\partial} g_3) = -\overline{\partial}\theta_\alpha(g_3) = -\overline{\partial}(g_2) \cdot dz = \theta_\alpha(g_1) \cdot d\bar{z}.$$

Since θ_α is invertible, we obtain $\overline{\partial} g_3 = g_1$. Thus we obtain the vanishing $\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)_{(2)}\big)$. ■

Lemma 21.12 *We have the vanishings* $\mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(E_\alpha)_{(2)}\big) = 0$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^0\big(\big(E_\alpha \otimes \Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\big) = 0$.

Proof It immediately follows from the invertibility of θ_α. ■

Therefore the proof of Lemma 21.7 is finished. ■

21.2.5 The case $\lambda \neq 0$, Preliminary

Let us continue to prove the case $\lambda \neq 0$ in Proposition 21.1. We consider the complex induced by the flat connection $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda,f}$ instead of $\mathbb{D}^\lambda$. Clearly, the complexes are naturally quasi isomorphic.

Let us consider the space $H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$ of the multi-valued flat section of $\mathcal{E}^\lambda$. We have the filtration $\mathcal{F}H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$ by an increasing order, and we have the generalized eigen decomposition $H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big) = \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathcal{S}p^f(\mathcal{E}^\lambda)} \mathbb{E}\big(H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big), \omega\big)$. We also have the weight filtration W on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}\big(H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)\big)$.

Let $\boldsymbol{s}$ be a frame of $H\big(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\big)$, which is compatible with the decomposition $\mathbb{E}$, the filtration $\mathcal{F}$, and the filtration W. We put as follows:

$$\omega(s_i) := \deg^{\mathbb{E}}(s_i), \quad b(s_i) := \deg^{\mathcal{F}}(s_i), \quad h(s_i) := \frac{1}{2}\deg^W(s_i).$$

We put $v_i := F(s_i, 0)$, and $\boldsymbol{v} = (v_i)$. Then we have $\mathbb{D}\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot A \cdot dz/z$ for some constant matrix $A \in M(r)$, whose eigenvalues α satisfy the condition $0 \leq \mathrm{Re}(\alpha) < 1$.

Let $\alpha(v_i)$ denote the complex number satisfying $\exp\big(-2\pi\sqrt{-1} \cdot \alpha(s_i)\big) = \omega(s_i)$ and $0 \leq \mathrm{Re}\,\alpha(s_i) < 1$. We also put as follows:

$$b(v_i) := b(s_i) - \mathrm{Re}\,\alpha(v_i), \quad h(v_i) := h(s_i).$$

We put $v_i' := v_i \cdot |z|^{b(v_i)} \cdot (-\log|z|)^{-h(v_i)}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}' := (v_i')$.

Lemma 21.13 *The* C^∞*-frame* $\boldsymbol{v}'$ *over* Δ^* *is adapted.*

Proof It is easy to reduce the claim to the norm estimate in one dimensional case. ▮

Let us consider the metric $\tilde{h}$ defined as follows:

$$\tilde{h}(v_i,v_j)=\delta_{i\,j}\cdot|z|^{-2b(v_i)}\big(-\log|z|\big)^{2h(v_i)}.$$

Then the metrics $\tilde{h}$ and h are mutually bounded. Thus we use $\tilde{h}$ in the following.

We have the decomposition $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}=\bigoplus_{\alpha\in\boldsymbol{C}}\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}$, where $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}$ is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}:=\big\langle v_i\,\big|\,\alpha(v_i)=\alpha\big\rangle.$$

The morphism Ψ is compatible with the decomposition, i.e., Ψ is a direct sum of the morphisms $\Psi_{\alpha}:\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha})$. The claim of Proposition 21.1 for $\lambda\neq 0$ immediately follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 21.14 *The Ψ_{α} is quasi isomorphic.*

Lemma 21.14, which is essentially due to Zucker, is proved in the subsubsections 21.2.6–21.2.7.

Before entering the proof of Lemma 21.14, we need some preparation. We have the filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}$ given as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_b\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}=\big\langle v_i\,\big|\,\alpha(v_i)=\alpha,b(v_i)\leq b\big\rangle.$$

We have the naturally induced frame $\boldsymbol{v}_{b,\alpha}:=\big(v_i\,\big|\,\alpha(v_i)=\alpha,b(v_i)=b\big)$. We also have the weight filtration W on $\mathrm{Gr}^{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}_b\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}\big)$:

$$W_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}_b\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}\big)=\big\langle v_i\,\big|\,\alpha(v_i)=\alpha,\,b(v_i)=b,\,2h(v_i)\leq h\big\rangle.$$

Then we obtain the vector bundle $V_{b,h}:=\mathrm{Gr}^{W}_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}_b\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha}\big)$. We have the naturally induced frame $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_{b,h}:=\big(\tilde{v}_i\,\big|\,\alpha(v_i)=\alpha,\,b(v_i)=b,\,2h(v_i)=h\big)$. Then we have the induced metric $\tilde{h}_{b,h}$ on $V_{b,h}$, for which we have $\tilde{h}_{b,h}\big(\tilde{v}_i,\tilde{v}_j\big)=\delta_{i\,j}\cdot|z|^{-2b}\cdot(-\log|z|)^{h}$. We also have the naturally induced connection ∇, for which we have $\nabla(\tilde{v}_i)=\tilde{v}_i\cdot\alpha\cdot dz/z$.

21.2.6 Proof of Lemma 21.14 (The case $\alpha=0$)

Due to Lemma 21.2, we have the following:

$$\mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V_{b,h})_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases}H(V_{b,h}), & (b<0,\ \text{or}\ b=0,h<0).\\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^1\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V_{b,h})_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases}\dfrac{dt}{t}\otimes V_{b,h} & (b<0,b=0,h\leq -2),\\[2ex] \mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\otimes e, & (b_0,h=1)\\[2ex] 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^2\big(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V_{b,h})_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases}\mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\wedge\dfrac{dt}{t}\otimes e & (b=0,h=-1),\\[2ex] 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

On the other hand, the following can be checked directly:

$$\mathcal{H}^0\big(\mathcal{L}(V_{b,h}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0})_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases}H\big(V_{b,h}\big), & (b<0,\ \text{or}\ b=0,h\leq 0),\\[2ex] 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^1\big(\big(V_{b,h}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\big)=\begin{cases}\dfrac{dt}{t}\otimes H\big(V_{b,h}\big), & (b<0,\ \text{or}\ b=0,h\leq -2),\\[2ex] 0 & (\text{otherwise}).\end{cases}$$

We have the spectral sequence:

$$E_1^{p,q}=\mathcal{H}^{p+q}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W_{-p}\,\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr)\Longrightarrow\mathcal{H}^{p+q}\bigl(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr)$$

$$E_1^{p,q}=\mathcal{H}^{p+q}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W_{-p}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr)\Longrightarrow\mathcal{H}^{p+q}\bigl(\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr).$$

We have $E_1^{p,q}=E_2^{p,q}$ for both of them. In the calculation of $E_3^{p,q}$, the $\mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\otimes e$ in $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V_{b,h})_{(2)})$ $(b=0,h=1)$ and $\mathfrak{M}_1\cdot dr\wedge dt/t\otimes e$ in $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(V_{b,h})_{(2)})$ $(b=0,h=-1)$ are canceled.

The morphism $\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\bigr)_{(2)}$ induces the morphisms of the spectral sequences. Then the induced morphisms are isomorphic at the E_3-level. As a consequence, the morphism $\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)\bigr)_{(2)}$ is quasi isomorphic.

As a result, we obtain that $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_0)_{(2)}$ is quasi isomorphic.

21.2.7 The proof of Lemma 21.14 (The case $\alpha\neq 0$)

Due to Lemma 21.1, we have the vanishing for $i=0,1,2$

$$\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha})\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr)=0.$$

The following vanishings can be checked by a direct calculation:

$$\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^W_h\,\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathcal{F}}_b(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}_{\alpha})\bigr)_{(2)}\bigr).$$

Thus the morphism $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ is quasi isomorphic. Therefore we obtain Lemma 21.14, and thus Proposition 21.1. ∎

21.3 Globalization of isomorphisms

21.3.1 First replacement

Let C be a quasi projective curve over $\boldsymbol{C}$, and $\overline{C}$ be the smooth completion. We take a Kahler metric of C which is equivalent to the Poincarè metric around the points $\overline{C}-C$. Then C is a complete Kahler manifold.

Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over C. Then we have the complex of sheaves $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ and $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}$ over $\overline{C}$.

Proposition 21.2 *The naturally defined morphisms* $\bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ *are quasi isomorphic.*

Proof It follows from Proposition 21.1. ∎

21.3.2 Second replacement

It is not so clear how we consider a family version of $\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ $(\lambda\in\boldsymbol{C})$. So we replace them, as is explained in the following. Let $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,*}$ denote the formal adjoint of the differential operator $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}$. Recall the formula of the Laplacians:

$$\Box_{\lambda}=\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\circ\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,*}+\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,*}\circ\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}=\bigl(1+|\lambda|^2\bigr)\Box_0=(\overline{\partial}+\theta)\circ(\overline{\partial}+\theta)^*+(\overline{\partial}+\theta)^*\circ(\overline{\partial}+\theta).\tag{417}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^0(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ denote the sheaf of germs of locally L^2-sections ϕ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}$ for which $\Box_{\lambda}\phi$ is L^2. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^1(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ denote the sheaf of germs of locally L^2-sections ϕ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^1$ for which $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}\phi$ and $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda\,*}\phi$ are L^2. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ denote the sheaf of germs of locally L^2-sections ϕ of $\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^2$. Then we obtain the complex of sheaves $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$. We have the naturally defined morphism $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$.

The following lemma is easy to see.

Lemma 21.15 *The sheaves* $\mathcal{L}^i(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^i(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ *are soft.* ∎

Lemma 21.16 *The morphism* $\Gamma\big(\overline{C},\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\big)\longrightarrow\Gamma\big(\overline{C},\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\big)$ *is quasi isomorphic.*

Proof We put $V:=\bigoplus L^2(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^i)$. Since the operator $\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}+\mathbb{D}^{\lambda *}$ on V is self adjoint. Thus we have the orthogonal decomposition $L^2\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^i\big)=\mathfrak{H}^i\oplus\mathrm{Im}\big(\mathbb{D}^{\lambda}+\mathbb{D}^{\lambda *}\big)$. Then we obtain the isomorphisms:

$$H^i\big(\Gamma\big(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\big)\big)\simeq H^i\big(\Gamma\big(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\big)\big)\simeq\mathfrak{H}^i.$$

Thus we are done. ■

The morphism $\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$ is decomposed into the morphisms $\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\longrightarrow\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}$. Thus we obtain the following.

Proposition 21.3 *We have the natural isomorphism of* $\mathbb{H}^i\big(\big(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\big)_{(2)}\big)\simeq H^i\big(\Gamma\big(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{\cdot}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda})_{(2)}\big)\big)$. ■

21.4 Family of isomorphisms

21.4.1 Family of L^2-complexes

Let C be a quasi projective curve and $\overline{C}$ be the smooth completion. We take a complete Kahler metric of C which is equivalent to Poincaré metric around $\overline{C}-C$. Then we have the naturally defined measure on $\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\times C$.

Let $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ be a tame harmonic bundle over C. Let $p_{\lambda}:\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}\times C\longrightarrow C$ denote the projection. Then we have the C^{∞}-bundle $\mathcal{E}=p_{\lambda}^{-1}E$. We have the naturally defined metric on $\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p$.

Let $\mathcal{L}^2\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$ denote the space of germs of L^2-sections of $\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p$ at the point (λ,P). Let f be an element of $\mathcal{L}^2\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$. Let us consider the following condition.

Condition 21.1 *There exist open subsets* $\lambda\in U_1\subset\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}$ *and* $P\in U_2\subset\overline{C}$, *and an element* $L^2(U_1\times U_2)$ *satisfying the following:*

1. *The germ of* F *at* (λ,P) *is* f.
2. *Due to Fubini's theorem,* F *induces the measurable function* $\Phi_F^{U_1\times U_2}:U_1\longrightarrow L^2(U_2,E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$. *Then the function* $\Phi_F^{U_1\times U_2}$ *is holomorphic.*

Note the following easy lemma.

Lemma 21.17 *Let* f *be an element of* $\mathcal{L}^2\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$. *Assume that there exist* U_i $(i=1,2)$ *and* F *as in Condition* 21.1. *Let* $\lambda\in U_1'$ *and* $P\in U_2'$ *be open subsets, and* F' *be an element of* $L^2(U_1'\times U_2')$ *whose germ is* f. *Then there exist open subsets* $\lambda\in U_1''$ *and* $P\in U_2''$ *be open subsets such that and* $F'_{|B}$ *satisfies the conditions* 1 *and* 2 *in Condition* 21.1. ■

Definition 21.1

- *An element* $f\in\mathcal{L}^2\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$ *is called* λ*-holomorphic, if Condition* 21.1 *holds for* f.
- *Let* $\mathcal{C}\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$ *denote the subspace of* $\mathcal{L}^2\big((\lambda,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$, *which consists of the* λ*-holomorphic germs.* ■

Lemma 21.18 *The following sequence is exact.*

$$0\longrightarrow\mathcal{C}\big((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)\xrightarrow{\lambda-\lambda_0}\mathcal{C}\big((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)\longrightarrow\mathcal{L}^2(P,\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega_C^p)\longrightarrow 0.$$

■

Let f be an element of $\mathcal{C}\big((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$. Let U_i $(i=1,2)$ and F be as in Condition 21.1, and then we obtain the holomorphic function $\Phi_F^{U_1\times U_2}:U_1\longrightarrow L^2\big(U_2,E\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$. Let U_i' $(i=1,2)$ and F' be also as in Condition 21.1, and then we obtain the holomorphic function $\Phi_{F'}^{U_1'\times U_2'}:U_1'\longrightarrow L^2\big(U_2',E\otimes\Omega_C^p\big)$. Let us take a sufficiently small open subset $U_1''\subset U_1\cap U_1'$, and let us put $U_2''=U_2\cap U_2'$. Then both of $\Phi_F^{U_1\times U_2}$ and

$\Phi_{F'}^{U_1'\times U_2'}$ induce the holomorphic morphisms $U_1''\longrightarrow L^2(U_2'',E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$, and they coincide. In this sense, the germ $f\in\mathcal{C}\bigl((\lambda_0,P),E\otimes\Omega_C^p\bigr)$ determines the germ Φ_f of holomorphic function to the space $\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$ at λ_0.

We put as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^0):=\bigl\{f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^0)\,\big|\,\Box f\in\mathcal{L}^2\bigl(P,E\otimes\Omega^0\bigr)\bigr\},$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^2):=\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^2).$$

We also put as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^1):=\left\{f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^1)\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}(\overline{\partial}+\theta)f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^2),\\(\overline{\partial}+\theta)^*f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^0)\end{array}\right\}.$$

Lemma 21.19 *Let λ be any element of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. We have the following:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^1):=\left\{f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^1)\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}\mathbb{D}^\lambda f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^2),\\\bigl(\mathbb{D}^\lambda\bigr)^*f\in\mathcal{L}^2(P,E\otimes\Omega^0)\end{array}\right\}.$$

Proof It follows from (417). $\blacksquare$

Let us consider the following condition for an element $f\in\mathcal{C}\bigl((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\bigr)$:

($\star$) Φ_f is the germ of a holomorphic function to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2\bigl(P,E\otimes\Omega^p\bigr)$ at P.

Then we put as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}\bigl((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^i\bigr):=\bigl\{f\in\mathcal{C}\bigl((\lambda_0,P),\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega_C^p\bigr)\,\big|\,f\text{ satisfies }(\star)\bigr\}.$$

Lemma 21.20 *The λ-connection induces the complex:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}\bigl((\lambda,P),E\otimes\Omega^0\bigr)\longrightarrow\tilde{\mathcal{C}}\bigl((\lambda,P),E\otimes\Omega^1\bigr)\longrightarrow\tilde{\mathcal{C}}\bigl((\lambda,P),E\otimes\Omega^2\bigr).$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 21.19. $\blacksquare$

Let $\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^2)$ denote the sheaf of germs $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ on $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda\times\overline{C}$. Due to Lemma 21.20, the λ-connection $\mathbb{D}$ induces the complex $\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})$.

Lemma 21.21 *We have the exact sequence of the complexes:*

$$0\longrightarrow\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\xrightarrow{\lambda-\lambda_0}\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\longrightarrow\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{E}^\lambda\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{(2)}\longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 21.18. $\blacksquare$

The following lemma can be checked directly.

Lemma 21.22 *The sheaves $\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^p)$ $(p=0,1,2)$ are f-soft for the projection $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda\times\overline{C}\longrightarrow\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. (See* [31] *for the definition of f-soft.)*

In particular, we have $R^if_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^p)=0$ for $i\neq 0$. $\blacksquare$

Hence $Rf_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$ is canonically quasi isomorphic to $f_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$. The sheaf $f_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^p)$ is naturally isomorphic to the sheaf of $\tilde{L}^2(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$-valued holomorphic functions over $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$, i.e., it corresponds to the trivial vector bundle $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda\times\tilde{L}^2(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$.

Lemma 21.23 *The complex $f_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$ is quasi isomorphic to $\bigoplus_i\mathfrak{H}^i[-i]$.*

Proof We regard $\bigoplus_i\mathfrak{H}^i[-i]$ as the complex with the trivial differential. We have the naturally defined morphism of $\bigoplus_i\mathfrak{H}^i[-i]$ to $f_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega_C^p)$. By using the argument in the subsubsection 2.8.1, we can show that the morphism is quasi isomorphic. $\blacksquare$

21.4.2 The sub-complex $\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}$ of $\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}$

Let λ_0 be a point of $\boldsymbol{C}_\lambda$. Let P be a point of $\bar{C}-C$. We pick an appropriate coordinate around P, then we can pick an embedding $\Delta\longrightarrow\overline{C}$ such that the image of O is P. Let us consider the restriction of $(E,\overline{\partial}_E,\theta,h)$ to Δ^*.

We take a sufficiently small positive number ϵ_0, then we have the filtration $V^{(\lambda_0)}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)$. We have the projections:

$$\pi_1: V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\leq -1}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr),$$

$$\pi_2: V^{(\lambda_0)}_{\leq 0}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_C\longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{0}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_C.$$

We have the generalized decomposition with respect to the action of $-\eth_z z$:

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)=\bigoplus\nolimits_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=-1}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1},-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr),$$

$$\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-0}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr)\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_C=\bigoplus\nolimits_{\mathfrak{p}(\lambda_0,u)=0}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{0},-\mathfrak{e}(\lambda,u)\bigr).$$

We put as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,0}:=\pi_1^{-1}\Bigl(W_1\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr),-1\bigr)\Bigr),\qquad \mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0),1}:=\pi_2^{-1}\Bigl(W_{-1}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{0}\bigl({}^\square\mathcal{E}\bigr),0\bigr)\otimes\Omega^{1,0}_C\Bigr).$$

We consider the above procedure for any point of $\bar{C}-C$. Then we obtain the complex $\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,\bullet}$ on $\bar{C}$.

Lemma 21.24 *We have the inclusion $\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,\bullet}\longrightarrow\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\bullet,0}$, which is quasi isomorphic.*

Proof The following morphism is isomorphic due to the strictly specializability of $\mathfrak{E}$:

$$\frac{\mathfrak{E}}{V^{(\lambda_0)}_{-1}(\mathfrak{E})}\longrightarrow\frac{\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}}{V^{(\lambda_0)}_{0}\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}}.$$

The following morphism is isomorphic, which we can show by using Proposition 15.1:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1}\,\mathfrak{E}}{W_1\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{-1},-1\bigr)}\longrightarrow\frac{\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{0}\,\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{1,0}}{W_{-1}\mathbb{E}\bigl(\mathrm{Gr}^{V^{(\lambda_0)}}_{0},0\bigr)\otimes\Omega^{1,0}}.$$

Then we obtain the result. ▮

Let us consider the case $\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)\subset\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 21.25 *We have the following commutative diagramm:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \bigl(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_1)} \arrow[r, "="] & \bigl(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof It can checked easily from the definition. ▮

21.4.3 The comparison of $\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})$

We have the natural inclusion:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\longrightarrow\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}. \tag{418}$$

Hence we obtain the morphism:

$$Rf_*\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)\longrightarrow Rf_*\bigl(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{|\mathcal{X}(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)}\bigr). \tag{419}$$

First let us consider the specialization of (419) at $\lambda\in\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$.

Lemma 21.26 *The following morphism is quasi isomorphic:*

$$Rf_*\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}} \longrightarrow Rf_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}} = Rf_*\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2\bigl(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot}\bigr).$$

Proof We have the natural inclusion:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda}} \longrightarrow \bigl(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)_{(2)}. \tag{420}$$

It is easy to check the morphism (420) is quasi isomorphic. Then the lemma immediately follows from Proposition 21.3. ▮

We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,\cdot} \arrow[r, "\lambda-\lambda_0"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,\cdot} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot}) \arrow[r, "\lambda-\lambda_0"] & \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot}) \arrow[r] & \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{(2)} \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let us consider the following induced commutative diagramm:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)\,\cdot}\bigr) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi"'] & \mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}_{|\mathcal{X}^{\lambda_0}}\bigr) \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{H}^i(f_*\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^i\bigl(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^2(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})_{(2)}\bigr)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{421}$$

Lemma 21.27 $\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(f_*\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr)$ *are isomorphic.*

Proof We will use a descending induction on i. We assume that the isomorphism for $i+1$ is shown, and we will show that the morphism for i is isomorphic.

Due to Lemma 21.23, the multiplication of $(\lambda-\lambda_0)$ on $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr)$ is injective. Hence we obtain that the upper vertical arrow in (421) is surjective. Due to Lemma 21.26, the right vertical arrow is isomorphic. Then we obtain the following:

$$\mathcal{H}^i(f_*\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})) = (\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\mathcal{H}^i(f_*\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})) + \operatorname{Im}\varphi.$$

Then we obtain the surjectivity of φ due to Nakayama's Lemma.

Let us show the injectivity of φ. Let f be a section of $\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)$ such that $\varphi(f)=0$. Since the right vertical arrow is isomorphic, f is of the form $(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot g$ for some section g of $\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)$. Since the multiplication of $(\lambda-\lambda_0)$ on $\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr)$ is injective, we obtain $\varphi(g)=0$. Thus we obtain $\operatorname{Ker}(\varphi)=(\lambda-\lambda_0)\cdot\operatorname{Ker}(\varphi)$. Then we obtain $\operatorname{Ker}(\varphi)=0$ due to Nakayama's Lemma. ▮

Lemma 21.28 *Let us consider the case* $\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)\subset\Delta(\lambda_0,\epsilon_0)$. *We have the following commutative diagramm:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_0)}\bigr)_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr)_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)} \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{Q}^{(\lambda_1)}\bigr) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr)_{|\Delta(\lambda_1,\epsilon_1)}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The horizontal arrows are isomorphic.

Proof It is clear from the definition. ▮

Lemma 21.29 *We have the canonical isomorphisms:*

$$\mathcal{H}^i\bigl(Rf_*\bigl(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot,0}\bigr)\bigr) \simeq \mathcal{H}^i\bigl(f_*\mathcal{S}(E\otimes\Omega^{\cdot})\bigr) \simeq \mathfrak{H}^i\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\boldsymbol{C}_{\lambda}}.$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 21.24, Lemma 21.25, Lemma 21.26 and Lemma 21.28. ▮

Corollary 21.1 *The induced $\mathcal{R}$-triple $\big(R^i f_*(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot}), R^i f_*(\mathfrak{E}\otimes\Omega^{\cdot}), C\big)$ is pure twistor of weight i. The polarization is naturally given. The hard Lefschetz theorem holds.*

Proof The twistor property and the positivity can be shown by an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 2.24 in the paper of Sabbah [42]. Since we can take the harmonic repesentatives of the cohomology classes, the hard Lefschetz theorem clearly holds. ▮

References

[1] L. V. Ahlfors, *An extension of Schwarz's lemma*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **43** (1938), 359–364.

[2] A. Andreotti and E. Vesentini, *Carlman estimates for the Laplace-Beltrami equation on complex manifolds*, Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. **25**, 313–362 (1965).

[3] T. Aubin, *Nonlinear analysis on manifolds. Monge-Ampére equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1982).

[4] O. Biquard, *Fibrés de Higgs et connexions intégrables: le cas logarithmique (diviseur lisse)*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **30** (1997), 41–96.

[5] J.-E. Björk, *Analytic D-modules and applications*, Kluwer Academic Publisher, (1993).

[6] J. -L. Brylinski, and S. Zucker, *An Overview of Recent Advances in Hodge theory*, in *Several Complex Variables VI,* Encyclopedia of Mathematical Science, **69**, Springer-Verlag, (1990), 39–142.

[7] E. Cattani, and A. Kaplan, *A Polarized mixed Hodge structures and the local monodromy of variation of Hodge structure*, Invent. Math. **67** (1982), 101–115.

[8] E. Cattani, A. Kaplan and W. Schmid, *Degeneration of Hodge structures*, Ann. of Math. **123** (1986), 457–535.

[9] E. Cattani, A. Kaplan and W. Schmid, *L^2 and intersection cohomologies for a polarized variation of Hodge structure,* Invent. Math. **87** (1987), 217–252.

[10] K. Corlette, *Flat G-bundles with canonical metrics*, J. Differential Geom. **28** (1988), 361–382.

[11] M. Cornalba and P. Griffiths, *Analytic cycles and vector bundles on noncompact algebraic varieties*, Invent. Math. **28** (1975), 1–106.

[12] P. Deligne, *Equation differentielles a points singularier reguliers,* Lectures Notes in Maths., vol. **163**, Springer, 1970.

[13] P. Deligne, *La conjecture de Weil II*, Publ. Math. IHES, **52**, (1980), 137–252.

[14] P. Deligne, *Un théorèm de finitude pour la monodromie*, Discrete Groups in Geometry and Analysis, Birhäuser, (1987), 1–19.

[15] S. K. Donaldson, *Infinite determinants, stable bundles and curvature*, Duke Math. J. **54**, (1987), 231–247.

[16] V. Drinfeld, *On a conjecture of Kashiwara*, math.AG/0108050.

[17] D. Gaitsgory, *On de Jong's conjecture* math.AG/0402184.

[18] R. Hamilton, *Harmonic maps of manifolds with boundary*, Lecture Notes in Math. vol. **471**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York. (1975)

[19] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, (1977).

[20] L. Hörmander, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990.

[21] S. Ito, *Functional Analysis*, (in Japanese), Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1983.

[22] J. Jost and K. Zuo, *Harmonic maps and* $\mathrm{Sl}(r, C)$*-representations of fundamental groups of quasiprojective manifolds*, J. Algebraic Geom. **5** (1996), 77–106.

[23] J. Jost and K. Zuo, *Harmonic maps of infinite energy and rigidity results for representations of fundamental groups of quasiprojective varieties*, J. Differential Geom. **47** (1997), 469–503.

[24] M. Kashiwara, *The Riemann-Hilbert problem for holonomic systems*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci., **10**, 563–579 (1975).

[25] M. Kashiwara, *The asymptotic behavior of a variation of polarized Hodge str.* Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci **21** (1985), 853–875.

[26] M. Kashiwara, *A study of variation of mixed Hodge structure*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **22** (1986), 991–1024.

[27] M. Kashiwara, *Poincaré lemma for a variation of polarized Hodge structure*, Lecture Notes in Math., **1246**, Springer, Berlin, (1987), 115–124.

[28] M. Kashiwara, *Semisimple holonomic D-modules*, in *Topological Field Theory, Primitive Forms and Related Topics*, Progress in Math, vol **160**, Birkhäuser, (1998), 267–271.

[29] M. Kashiwara, *D-modules and microlocal calculus,* Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **217**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, (2003).

[30] M. Kashiwara and T. Kawai, *The Poincaré lemma for variations of polarized Hodge structure*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **23** (1987), 345–407.

[31] M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira, *Sheaves on Manifolds*, Springer, (1990).

[32] S. Kobayashi, *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, (1987).

[33] K. Kodaira, *A differential-geometric method in the theory of analytic stacks* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **39**, (1953). 1268–1273.

[34] T-W Ma, *Banach-Hilbert spaces, vector measures and group representations*, World Scientific, Singapore, (2002).

[35] M. Maruyama and K. Yokogawa, *Moduli of parabolic stable sheaves*, Math. Ann. **293**, 77–99 (1992).

[36] Z. Mebkhout, *Le formalisme des six opérations de Grothendieck pour les D-modules cohérent*, Hermann, Paris, (1989).

[37] Z. Mebkhout and C. Sabbah, *D-modules et cycles évanscents,* in *Le formalisme des six opérations de Grothendieck pour les D-modules cohérents*, Hermann, Paris, (1989), 201–239.

[38] T. Mochizuki, *Asymptotic behaviour of tame nilpotent harmonic bundles with trivial parabolic structure*, J. Diff. Geometry, **62**, (2002), 351–559.

[39] T. Mochizuki, *A characterization of semisimple local system by tame pure imaginary pluri-harmonic metric*, math.DG/0402122.

[40] R. Palais, *Foundations of global non-linear analysis*, Benjamin, (1968).

[41] G. de Rham, *Differentiable manifolds. Forms, currents, harmonic forms.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1984).

[42] C. Sabbah, *Polarizable twistor D-modules*, available at the web page of Sabbah.

[43] C. Sabbah, *Polarizable twistor D-modules* (the revised version), available at the web page of Sabbah.

[44] M. Saito, *Modules de Hodge polarisables*, Publ. RIMS., **24** (1988), 849–995.

[45] M. Saito, *Duality for vanishing cycle functors*, Publ. RIMS., **25**, (1989), 889–921.

[46] M. Saito, *Mixed Hodge modules*, Publ. RIMS., **26**, (1990), 221-333.

[47] W. Schmid, *Variation of Hodge structure: the singularities of the period mapping*, Invent. Math. **22** (1973), 211–319.

[48] B. Shiffman and A. J. Sommese, *Vanishing Theorems on Complex Manifolds*, Progress in Math. **56**, Birkhäuser, (1985)

[49] C. Simpson, *Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and application to uniformization*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), 867–918.

[50] C. Simpson, *Harmonic bundles on non-compact curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), 713–770.

[51] C. Simpson, *Higgs bundles and local systmes*, Publ. IHES, **75** (1992), 5–95.

[52] C. Simpson, *Mixed twistor structures*, math.AG/9705006.

[53] C. Simpson, *The Hodge filtration on nonabelian cohomology. Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, 217–281, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 62, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[54] K. Uhlenbeck, *Connections with L^p bounds on curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83**, (1982) 31–42.

[55] K. Uhlenbeck and S. T. Yau, *On the existence of Hermitian Yang-Mills connections in stable bundles*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 39-S (1986), 257–293.

[56] K. Yokogawa, *Compactification of moduli of parabolic sheaves and moduli of parabolic Higgs sheaves*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **33** (1993) 451–504.

[57] S. Zucker, *Hodge theory with degenerating coefficients: L^2 cohomology in the Poincaré metric*, Ann of Math. **109** (1979), 415–476.

[58] K. Zuo, *Representations of Fundamental Groups of Algebraic Varieties*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1708**, Springer (1999).

Address
Department of Mathematics, Osaka City University, Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka 558-8585, Japan.
takuro@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp